

CHINESE HISTORY



BY ALEXANDER W. CHU

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFER, 1868; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT OF
THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

OFFICERS FOR 1945

HAROLD S. BENDIX	President
FRANCY V. NORWOOD	Vice President
THOMAS C. PRICE, JR.	Secretary
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS	Treasurer
CHARLES E. MANN	Assistant Secretary

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.

WILLIAM FRASER	J. W. BUCELER
HERBERT WALLACE SCOTT	E. R. HARDY, JR.
ROBERT E. E. HARRISON	CYRIL C. RICHARDSON
CHARLES H. LITTLE	KENNETH S. LATOURETTE
ROLAND H. BAINTON	EMMETT G. SCHWILHEIT

EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
HAROLD S. BENDIX, *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, BLOOM, INDIANA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, 92 SHERMAN STREET, HARTFORD 5, CONN.

Church History is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is three dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year should be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, Sherman Street, Hartford 5, Conn., or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 99 Claremont Ave., New York 27, N. Y. Remittances should be made to the American Society of Church History.

All communications regarding contributions, book reviews, and all other correspondence of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 92 Sherman Street, Hartford 5, Conn.

Changes of mailing numbers and changes of address should be addressed to Prof. R. H. Nichols, 99 Claremont Ave., New York 27, N. Y.

Entered as second class matter March 9, 1934, at the post office at Hartford, Conn., and registered as a second class mail on March 9, 1934.

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
HAROLD S. BENDER, *ex officio*

Vol. XII

September, 1943

No. 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

POLITICAL FACTORS IN MOVEMENTS TOWARD CHRISTIAN UNITY IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY EUROPE

J. Minton Batten 163

GERRARD WINSTANLEY AND THE EARLY QUAKERS

Winthrop S. Hudson 177

MUSIC IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH BEFORE AND AT THE TIME OF J. S. BACH

Richard Schoenbohm 195

THE DOCTRINAL INTERESTS OF MARIUS MERCATOR

William Bark 210

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

217

BARON, SALO: *The Jewish Community: Its History and Structure to the American Revolution* William A. Irwin

FILSON, FLOYD V.: *One Lord One Faith* Martin Rist

HOLSAPPLE, LLOYD B.: *Constantine the Great* E. R. Hardy, Jr.

BRAEGELMANN, SISTER ATHANASIUS, O. S. B.: *The Life and Writings of Saint Ildefonsus of Toledo* Raymond J. Gray, S.J.

TSCHAN, FRANCIS J.: *Saint Bernward of Hildesheim* Raymond J. Gray, S.J.

BRICKMAN, BENJAMIN: *An Introduction to Francesco Patrizi's Nova de Universis Philosophia* Roland H. Bainton

CARRUTHERS, S. W.: *The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly* Robert Hastings Nichols

SPINKA, MATTHEW: *John Amos Comenius: That Incomparable Moravian* I. L. Kandel

LATOURETTE, KENNETH SCOTT: *The Great Century in the Americas, Australasia, and Africa, A. D. 1800-A. D. 1914* J. Minton Batten

BEARDSLEY, FRANK GRENVILLE: *Religious Progress through Religious Revivals* J. Orin Oliphant

POST, ALBERT: *Popular Freethought in America, 1825-1850* Irving Stoddard Kull

MARTIN, ISAAC PATTON: *Elijah Embree Hoss: Ecumenical Methodist* J. Minton Batten

HÖYE, BJARNE AND ÅGER, TRYGVE M.: *The Fight of the Norwegian Church against Nazism* P. Stiansen

Gift
L. B. Vande Velle
3-9-48

POLITICAL FACTORS IN MOVEMENTS TOWARD CHRISTIAN UNITY IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY EUROPE

J. MINTON BATTEN
Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.

I.

Religious, political, and economic forces have given direction to the stream of modern history. Though all these forces operate in every age, each has exercised the major influence for a definite period of the modern era. Religious forces were dominant in the sixteenth century. Then religious values were regarded as of primary concern. The great thinkers on political and economic subjects usually based their ideas on religious principles. The major wars were Wars of Religion.

In the seventeenth century political forces began to exercise the dominant influence. The transition, though gradual, was complete by the end of the Thirty Years' War. Perhaps, as Quincy Wright suggests, political factors began to outweigh religious factors in the year 1630, when the Thirty Years' War ceased to be a War of Religion and was suddenly transformed into a war of competing nationalisms.¹ Certainly the Peace of Westphalia indicated the eclipse of the medieval concept of universal unity in church and state. The thorough secularization of polities had been completed as a result of the political ideas of Renaissance thinkers, the fanatical and futile destructiveness of the Wars of Religion, and the rise of the western state system. In 1648 the map of Europe was remade for the first time on the basis of power politics of the modern type. The men who remade the map agreed that henceforth Protestants and Catholics must learn to live together in the new family of nations. Religious differences were relegated to a position of minor importance as statesmen planned the future of Europe primarily on the basis of political considerations. Since 1789, religious and political factors have tended to give place to economic forces, which have become increasingly important. These

¹ Quincy Wright, *A Study of War* (Chicago, 1942), 197, 724, 725.

economic forces are chiefly responsible for the new types of nationalism, imperialism, militarism, and international anarchy of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In the seventeenth century, European civilization made its first long stride toward the tragic situation which threatens its very existence today. Many men of the century recognized the seriousness of this step. They labored to secure co-operation among nations. They sought unity among Christians. Today their rejected proposals for international co-operation and Christian unity are being revived as possible sources of hope for the preservation of the remnants of civilization and for more effective Christian service to a war-torn world. Europe of the seventeenth century paid little heed to these prophets of a better order in church and state. But their work in the interests of peace, co-operation, and unity may furnish some light toward the solution of the problems of a despairing world.

The seventeenth century needed the work of peace makers. Richard Baxter correctly described it as a "contentious, dividing age."² Conflict was the dominant note in affairs of both church and state. Western Europe, then in final transition from medieval to modern times, preserved all the accumulated political and ecclesiastical tensions of the period of the Renaissance and the Reformation. These divisive trends, inherited from the past, were supplemented by new causes of conflict which were to disturb the peace of the world for centuries. As a result of these multiplied tensions there was an almost constant state of war. During the century there was no single three-year period in which all the European powers were free from foreign and civil war.

These wars of the seventeenth century provide the outward manifestations of the inner tensions of the age. They reveal the strange blending of the old and the new causes of conflict. In 1600, England was at war with Spain, thus continuing the struggle against Spanish domination which had occasioned many of the Wars of Religion. A hopelessly divided Germany was still engaged in the struggle against the Turks. France was making the first effort toward recovery from the disastrous effects of the long series of civil wars occasioned by religious issues and the attempts to crush surviving features of the feudal system.

2 Richard Baxter, *Universal Concord* (London, 1660) title page.

The Thirty Years' War was the most important factor in the history of international relations during the first half of the century. This struggle clearly evidenced the tensions which had destroyed the peace of Europe in the preceding century. France was at war with the Hapsburgs; Protestants fought to curb the increasing aggressiveness of Roman Catholics; and the Emperor once more struggled to limit the power of rebellious German princes. But the fury and the destructiveness of the war became more pronounced when all the members of the western state system came to regard the conflict as a resort to force to achieve the objectives of power politics. Then all the major powers became engaged in a general European war of the type which was often to be repeated in the centuries to follow.

In the second half of the century the peace of Europe was broken repeatedly by wars which resulted from the ambitious greed of the absolute monarchs, who were employing for their purposes the new nationalism, the new imperialism, and also the new militarism which had resulted from the professionalization of the military forces. The efforts of Louis XIV to secure French domination destroyed the new balance of power that had been carefully arranged in the Peace of Westphalia. There followed numerous attempts to secure effective counterweights through the establishment of military alliances. These developments plunged Europe into a new series of wars which were to last throughout the seventeenth century.

Conflict was also the characteristic feature of the ecclesiastical life of the century. In the era of the Reformation the protests of the Reformers against the accumulated abuses of the medieval church and the counter-charges of a revived Roman Catholicism produced the cleavage of Western Christendom and destroyed the formal unity of the church. The separatists from Rome showed a marked tendency to form distinct communions which, at first, followed territorial and national lines. Owing to political, personal, nationalistic, and theological differences, the lines of demarcation between the various Protestant groups were more clearly defined and denominationalism became a characteristic feature of church life. The rise of various types of Protestant scholasticism intensified the strife over confessional differences and the Wars of Religion increased the hatreds of the age.

These developments of the Reformation era appeared with increased force in the seventeenth century. Centrifugal tendencies dominated church life. The Gallican movement and the rise of Jansenism indicate the presence of divisive trends within the Roman Catholic Church. The conflict between Protestants and Roman Catholics steadily became more bitter as the full weight of the new strength of the Counter-Reformation movement manifested itself in various efforts designed to limit the sphere of Protestant influence.

There was widespread discord among Protestants as the century opened. In Germany the relationships between Lutheran and Reformed Churches became more unfriendly as the Reformed Church made steady inroads into Lutheran territory. The demands of the Reformed Church for recognition similar to that granted to the Lutherans by the Peace of Augsburg occasioned a mass of polemical literature which contained personal attacks of a type inevitably provocative of more discord. Furthermore, a long series of controversies among the Lutherans of Germany—such as the Antinomian, Osiandrian, Crypto-Calvinistic, Majoristic, and Syncretistic disputes—divided Lutheran theologians into contending groups. All efforts to promote peace between these contending factions on the basis of acceptance of the Formula of Concord merely served to produce new types of divergent opinion and to encourage the development of more rigid forms of Lutheran scholasticism.

The Calvinists, especially those of the Netherlands, were divided over the issues raised by the vigorous protests of Arminius and his associates against the prevailing Calvinistic scholasticism. Numerous divisive tendencies of far-reaching importance appeared in the British Isles. Strife between Anglicans and Scottish Presbyterians was inevitable after the crown of England passed into the hands of the Stuarts, who were determined to mold the Church of Scotland after the model of the Church of England. Within the Church of England there was increasing discord between Puritan and strict Anglican groups. Vigorous controversies arose between the champions of the Established Church and the Free Churches. The tense situation was further complicated by the rivalry between Presbyterianism and Independency. Thus incessant controversy over matters of doctrine, polity, and worship, together with the consequent emergence of new religious denomin-

ations, constitute the major developments in the church history of the period.

II

In the light of the facts, it is not strange that the voices of the peacemakers were generally obscured by the din of war and the noise of theological controversy. However, many rulers, statesmen, and scholars recognized the trend toward the destruction of civilization by war and sought to curb the tendencies of the time by elaborating ingenious proposals for organizations and policies that would unite the nations in a peaceful world society. In fact, no century, except our own, has been more productive of schemes for preserving peace, securing international co-operation, and establishing the reign of international law.

The so-called Grand Design of Henry IV is illustrative of this interest. Whether the Grand Design was the product of the fertile brain of the French Monarch, or, as now seems more probable, an afterthought of his minister, Sully, it embodies a unique proposal for a concert of powers. According to this plan, fifteen European states were to form the nucleus of "a universal most Christian republic . . . composed of all those kings and potentates who profess the name of Christ."³ The objective of the organization was to secure the peace of Christendom. The powers were to send representatives to a general council, which was to serve as a forum for the discussion of international problems and an agency for the settlement of disputes between nations. This general council was to be provided with an international army and navy to enforce its decisions.

In 1623, a keen-minded French monk, Emeric Crucé, published a book of advice to princes, entitled *Le Nouveau Cynée*, which proposed a more elaborate program for international organization.⁴ He suggested the formation of a world federation of states, with both Christian and non-Christian nations as members. An elaborate organization, including a world assembly and a world court, should be established, he argued, in order to encourage freedom of trade and communication, to

³ F. M. Russell, *Theories of International Relations* (New York, 1936), 170. On the Grand Design, see also Schuman, *International Politics* (New York, 1933), 234; and Wright, *A Study of War*, 361, 432.

⁴ Russell, *op. cit.*, 63; Schuman, *op. cit.*, 234; Wright, *op. cit.*, 430ff.

provide means for negotiation and arbitration between nations, and to preserve an organized peace.

In 1625, Hugo Grotius published his legal masterpiece, *On the Law of War and Peace*. The book resulted from his observations of the barbarities and international anarchy of the Thirty Years' War. Grotius says:

I saw prevailing throughout the Christian world a license in making war of which even barbarous nations would have been ashamed, recourse being had to arms for slight reasons or no reason; and when arms were once taken up, all reverence for divine and human law was thrown away, just as if men were thenceforth authorized to commit all crimes without restraint.⁵

Using both custom and reason as sources, he was able to construct the most adequate and comprehensive statement of international law which had yet appeared. In laying the foundation for the whole structure of modern international jurisprudence, Grotius ranks among the most important proponents of a new world order governed by the law of nations.

The practical statesmen who spent years in negotiating the intricate terms of the Peace of Westphalia were also concerned with the problem of organizing a peaceful family of nations. They weighed the issues and finally reached the conclusion that such a family of nations could be established only on the basis of the balance of power. Rejecting the theories of world-empire, world-church, and world-federation, they arranged a new European family of nations on this basis. They and many of their contemporaries believed that community of interest within the western state system would make this principle function in the interest of peace. As Treitschke says: "The Peace of Westphalia came to be looked upon like a *ratio scripta* of international law; everyone uttered thanksgiving that some sort of *status quo* had now been established. People began to feel themselves part of an organized European society, and all the sovereign states began, as it were, to form one great family."⁶

William Penn's *Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe*, published in 1693, is another noteworthy seventeenth century contribution toward the literature favoring international federation. Penn argued that there should be a

⁵ Quoted by Hallock Heicher, in *Modern World Politics* (New York, 1942), 113.

⁶ Schuman, *op. cit.*, 76.

"General Dyet, Estates or Parliament," composed of representatives of the nations and empowered to settle international disputes and initiate common action to curb aggression.⁷

This search by statesmen for a workable program of international co-operation is paralleled in the contemporary church history by a similar interest in the unity of the churches. Indeed, the record is clear that churchmen surpassed the statesmen in peace efforts because of the number and variety of their proposals for ecclesiastical peace, federation and unity. Though the churches had inherited all the divisive tendencies of the sixteenth century, their leaders knew that the Reformers had generally maintained the contention that there was one universal church. They had cherished the hope that freedom from Rome would prepare the way for a revival of the long-neglected concept of catholicity expressed in a universal free communion. There is ample proof that the Reformers desired the visible unity of the church and were in accord in their expressions of longing for the establishment and recognition of a Catholic Protestantism.⁸

Irenic leaders of the seventeenth century attempted to translate this hope of the Reformers into reality. Daring to row against the current of the times, they sought to heal the rapidly multiplying divisions of Christendom. There were eight major types of ecclesiastical controversy which disturbed the peace of the churches during the century, viz: the alignment of Roman Catholics against Protestants; of Lutherans who accepted the Formula of Concord against the Lutherans who rejected it; of Lutherans against Calvinists; of Remonstrants against Counter-Remonstrants; of Anglicans against Scottish Presbyterians; of Puritans against strict Anglicans; of Anglicans against Separatists; and the alignment of English Presbyterians against English Independents.⁹

7 Russell, *op. cit.*, 174 ff.

8 John T. McNeill, *Unitive Protestantism* (New York, 1930), 133-254.

9 Accounts of the varied reunion attempts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are presented by such writers as M. Tabaraud, *De La Réunion des Communions Chrétiniennes* (Paris, 1808); C. W. Hering, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Unionsversuche seit der Reformation bis auf unsere Zeit* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1836-1838); C. G. Neudecker, *Die Hauptversuche zur Pacification der Evangel-Protest-Kirche Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1846); D. Schenkel, *Der Unionsberuf des Evangelischen Protestantismus* (Heidelberg, 1855); F. Brandes, *Geschichte der evangelischen Union in Preussen* (Bd. I, Gotha, 1872); C. Sepp, *Polemische en Irenische Theologie* (Leyden, 1881); H. Leube, *Kalvinismus und Luthertum* (Bd. I, Leipzig, 1928); G. J. Slosser, *Christian Unity, Its History and Challenge* (New York, 1929); J. T. McNeill, *Unitive Protestantism* (New York, 1930).

There were earnest churchmen who devoted themselves with unwearied zeal to the task of settling each of these types of controversy. The methods proposed by irenic advocates and civil rulers for use in healing the divisions of Christendom cover the widest possible range, including such proposals as conciliation through personal conferences between theologians, the revival of the principle of conciliarism, the preparation of a harmony of existing confessions, agreement on some *consensus* of belief accepted in the early church, comprehension, absorption, the use of political pressure, and the resort to armed force. A list of the more distinguished irenic leaders proves the fact that no century has produced more outstanding advocates of peace among the churches. Such a list should include the names of Andreae, Pareus, William Forbes, John Forbes of Corse, Davenant, Comenius, Calixtus, Dury, Hugo Grotius, Ussher, Owen, Baxter, Burroughs, Stillingfleet, Molanus, Spinola, Leibnitz, Bossuet, and Spener.¹⁰ In every decade of the century there were significant negotiations which were designed to promote Christian communion, settle the peace of the churches, and advance the cause of Christian reunion. Likewise in each decade of the century one or more books on the problem of the reunion of the churches appeared.¹¹ Many of these books deserve a lasting place in the literature of Christian irenics and furnish suggestions which could be of service in

10 Scholarly monographs on the reunion activities of some of these irenic leaders have been prepared: so, Hans Friedrich, *Georg Calixtus der Unionsmann der 17. Jahrhunderts* (Anklam, 1891); Matthew Spinka, *John Amos Comenius, That Incomparable Moravian* (Chicago, 1943); and G. J. Jordan, *The Reunion of the Churches, A Study of G. W. Leibnitz and His Great Attempt* (London, 1927).

11 Among the more important irenic works of the seventeenth century the following should be noted: John Valentine Andreae, *Fama Fraternitatis* (circulating in manuscript by 1610, published 1614); David Pareus, *Irenicum de unione et synodo Evangelicorum concilianda* (1614); William Forbes, *Considerationes modestae et pacifice controversiarum de justificatione, purgatorio, invocatione sanctorum Christo mediatore et Eucharistia* (published posthumously at London, 1658, at Helmstadt, 1704); John Forbes, *Irenicum amatoribus veritatis et pacis in Ecclesia Scoticana* (1629); John Davenant, *An Exhortation to Brotherly Communion Betwixt the Protestant Churches* (1641); Hugo Grotius, *Via ad pacem ecclesiasticam* (1642); *Votum pro pace ecclesiastica* (1642); John Amos Comenius, *De Dissidentium in rebus fidei Christianorum Reconciliatione Hypomnemata quaedam amicci ad amicum* (1643); *Christianismus reconciliabilis reconciliatore Christo* (1646); George Calixtus, *Judicium de controversiis theologicis quae inter Lutheranos et Reformatos agitantur, et de mutua partium fraternitate atque tolerantiae propter consensum in fundamentis* (1650); John Matthiae, *Ramus Olivae Septentrionalis* (1656); Richard Baxter, *Universal Concord* (1660); Edward Stillingfleet, *Irenicum A Weapon Salve for the Churches Wounds* (1661); John Owen, *Union Among Protestants* (1680); Gerhard Molanus, *Regula circa Christianorum omnium ecclesiasticam* (1691); and the numerous works on Christian reunion by John Dury, 1629-1677.

present-day efforts to secure ecclesiastical co-operation, federation, and unity.

The fervor and zeal of these irenic leaders has never been surpassed in Christian history. However, all their reunion projects failed to attain their announced objectives. Interdenominational rivalry and theological strife were to continue through the centuries. How shall we explain the failure of these earnest men? Partial responsibility is to be attributed to the inherited bitterness arising out of the theological controversies of the Reformation period, the increased tensions occasioned by the Wars of Religion, and the development of rigid types of Protestant scholasticism. But the achievements and failures of the seventeenth century irenic advocates can never be properly evaluated without constant reference to the political environment in which they lived. Political forces were in ascendancy in this new era. Religion was ceasing to be a dominant concern. Politics had become thoroughly secularized. In the interaction of political and religious forces, the political factors usually gained first consideration in the minds of both rulers and subjects. Irenic advocates constantly appealed to rulers and to public opinion in support of their programs. Though the responses show much variety, in the last analysis they were almost uniformly motivated by political considerations.

Political factors were chiefly responsible for the origin, form, method, and results of most of the seventeenth century conferences which discussed the problems disturbing the peace of the churches. The list of such meetings is impressive, including the Hampton Court Conference, 1604; the Synod of Charenton, 1614; the Synod of Dort, 1619; the Leipzig Colloquy, 1631; the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1649; the Synod of Thorn, 1645; the Cassel Colloquy, 1661; the Savoy Conference, 1661; and, the Berlin Colloquy, 1662-1663. Many of these conferences failed partly because of the lack of conciliatory spirit on the part of the participating theologians, but a detailed study of their history will prove that the pressure of political circumstances was the most important cause of their ultimate failure to achieve the peaceful settlement of the problems involved.

III

Repeatedly, during the course of the century, rulers and statesmen co-operated with union advocates in their efforts to

settle the discord which prevailed among the churches. Programs designed to secure ecclesiastical peace and unity were sponsored by Gustavus Adolphus, Oxenstierna, Ladislav IV of Poland, Cromwell, Frederick William of Brandenburg, William VI of Hesse-Cassel, and other rulers and statesmen. The union efforts of Gustavus Adolphus are worthy of special attention. They furnish an excellent illustration of the combination of religious and political motives which often prompted sovereigns to work with irenic leaders in efforts to secure the union of the churches.¹²

The tutors of Gustavus trained him to be a Lutheran, without fanaticism and dogmatic narrowness. Throughout his reign as king, he was constantly concerned over the dangers threatening Sweden and all Protestant countries because of the new aggressiveness on the part of Roman Catholic powers. As early as 1614, he was interested in the formation of an Evangelical Alliance to meet this danger. Dynastic necessity, as well as personal conviction, made him the champion of Protestantism. After defeating Russia and Poland, he was free to intervene in the Thirty Years' War. The request of the German Protestant princes for Swedish intervention appealed strongly to his personal sympathies and to his political ambitions. He wished to deliver the Lutherans and Calvinists of Germany from the tyranny of their conquerors. He knew that their deliverance could be accomplished more easily if peace and unity could be established among Protestants. If the unity of the German Protestantism and deliverance from imperial oppression could be achieved under his leadership, then Sweden's position would be secure among the European powers.

These objectives prompted Gustavus first to seek reconciliation between the Reformed and Lutherans in the territories held by Sweden. He also encouraged his allies among the German princes, particularly the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, to promote movements toward the reconciliation of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. With the encouragement of the two electors, theological representatives of these competing churches, meeting in the Leipzig Colloquy of 1631, came nearer an agreement than at any time since the Marburg Colloquy of 1529. In 1632, encouraged by this progress and

¹² See Gunnar Westin, *Negotiations About Church Unity, 1628-1634* (Uppsala, 1932), 42 ff.

by the arguments of irenic advocates, Gustavus pledged himself to become the patron of a more far-reaching scheme for the unification of the Lutheran and Calvinistic branches of Protestantism. His death brought this scheme to a sudden end, as Oxenstierna was unable to consolidate and preserve the alliance of the Lutheran and Reformed princes. Thus, the movement for Protestant union under Swedish sponsorship was terminated suddenly by the changing political situation. Similar developments attended the support of projects for religious reunion by each of the rulers who attempted to translate the plans of the irenic advocates into actual practice.

IV

Though only a few rulers gave sympathetic hearing to the appeals of the irenic advocates, most of the sovereigns of Europe were interested in the reunion of the churches for political reasons. This was the age of incipient nationalism, and religious unity was then regarded as a strong support for the nationalistic spirit. Rulers in the seventeenth century asserted the claims of absolute monarchy and supported such claims by the theory of the divine right of kings. These considerations, supplemented by the precedent of princely authority to decide the religious affiliation of subjects as legalized by the Peace of Augsburg, prompted princes to seek religious unity among their subjects. The thoroughgoing Erastianism of the seventeenth century rulers was responsible for the initiation of numerous projects for religious unity. Indeed, the church unity projects sponsored by princes chiefly for political reasons far outnumber those occasioned by the fervent arguments of irenic advocates, who were pleading for a unity that was in accord with the essential character of the Christian faith.

In many Roman Catholic countries, religious unity was reestablished by repressive measures designed to destroy the surviving remnants of Protestantism. The Hapsburgs uniformly sought this type of union in the territories which came under their control by absorption and conquest. Roman Catholicism was restored to its former position in Poland and in many of the German principalities on the basis of coercive uniformity. The Duke of Savoy murdered Piedmontese Protestants in an effort to achieve religious unity among his

subjects. It is probable that Louis XIV regarded himself as making a significant contribution toward the unity of Christianity when he ordered the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Though Erastianism in Protestant countries occasioned many seventeenth century efforts toward union of the churches, the attempts to secure coercive uniformity met with ultimate failure. Stuart kings could not establish lasting religious uniformity between England and Scotland; they were unable to suppress the Puritan movement within the Anglican Church; and they failed in their final struggle for uniformity after the Restoration. The German Protestant princes who attempted to enforce unity met with similar defeat. In the Netherlands the harsh efforts to compel agreement between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants proved equally futile. In the light of recent research, the course of these developments is becoming increasingly clear. In Protestant lands the Erastian policies of temporal rulers prompted religious dissenters to organize political movements and these politico-religious revolutionaries proved so great a threat to the security of the state that they were able to exact a measure of toleration for dissenting groups. This concession could be more readily made owing to the fact that the secularization of politics prompted rulers to value the internal security of the state more highly than religious uniformity. Therefore, princes gradually became convinced that it was wise to sanction a policy of comprehension in state churches, to increase toleration for dissenting groups, and to grant more religious liberty for individual citizens. Though the Erastian attempts to compel church unity failed, the seventeenth century development of the idea and practice of toleration and religious liberty constitutes a landmark in the history of human progress. The same political factors were responsible for the defeat of the Erastian unification projects and for the victories won in behalf of toleration and religious liberty.

V

On the basis of a careful survey of the movements toward Christian reunion in the seventeenth century, some conclusions may be reached with a fair degree of certainty. These conclusions may be summarized as follows: (1) in that century there was more interest and activity in reunion effort than in

any era except our own; (2) the proposals for interconfessional peace and unity closely parallel the contemporary proposals for international agencies designed to secure peace between nations; (3) all major attempts by civil rulers to co-operate with irenic leaders in the realization of their schemes resulted in ultimate failure; (4) Roman Catholic princes achieved some progress toward religious unity within their dominions by the use of force, but the resulting coercive uniformity was foreign both to the essential character of the Christian faith and the liberal spirit of the modern age; (5) the Erastian policies of the Protestant princes designed to secure coercive uniformity resulted in failure in every case. Political factors were chiefly responsible for these developments.

Despite such negative results, the seventeenth century experiments in reunion effort contributed influences in the development of modern life which are numerous, enduring, and valuable. By these experiments men learned that unity achieved by force is out of accord with the genius of Christianity and the spirit of modern liberalism. They also learned that real progress toward unity of spirit and effective organic union could be attained only by a Christian leadership that was untrammelled by the restrictions of political authority. Moreover, it should be noted that this century created a literature in the field of Christian irenics and that this literature has influenced all subsequent reunion efforts. New methods in the promotion of Christian reunion were developed and these methods furnished the patterns for later and more successful union activity.

The most important single achievement of the irenic advocates mentioned in this discussion is to be found in their success in preserving the concept of unity in an age when political trends made successful union work impossible. These men transmitted to the modern church the Reformers' ideas of the desirability of a united Protestantism and the possibility of a united Christendom.

Moreover, their work contributed other influences of far-reaching importance. Arguments *pro* and *con* on the subject of Christian reunion furnished some of the materials used to support modern theories of toleration and religious liberty. The irenic advocates, by their earnest search for a fundamental confession of faith, encouraged the development of a latitudinarian

viewpoint which contributed to the rise of theological liberalism. Their insistence on the superiority of practical divinity over dogmatic theology, together with their labored efforts to solve cases of conscience, helped to curb Protestant scholasticism and encouraged a new and significant emphasis on the ethical content of the Christian message.

Many of the advocates of Christian reunion were convinced that cultural unity would prepare the way for religious unity. Comenius and his associates developed schemes for the international exchange of cultural ideas, arranged elaborate programs for educational reform, and encouraged the formation of scientific societies, such as the Royal Society in England. In thus promoting cultural unity as a step toward religious unity they made further significant contributions to modern life.

Despite the failures of the seventeenth century advocates of Christian reunion—failures due chiefly to political factors—their long-neglected ideas now enlist more support than they secured when they were first published to the world. The work of these men is an important phase of the historical background of the present movement toward Christian reunion.

GERRARD WINSTANLEY AND THE EARLY QUAKERS

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.

Considerable mystery has long surrounded the antecedents of the Society of Friends. George Fox, an unlettered country lad, has been pictured as having gathered the Society after receiving, through a series of direct revelations, a full-blown message of redemption. Quaker historians have sought to confirm this portrayal by emphasizing that it was "in communion with his deepest self" that he made his "great spiritual discovery,"¹ and that it came to him from no outward source. This explanation seemed rather naive to the more sophisticated mind of Rufus M. Jones, and he set himself to the task of uncovering the actual source from which Fox's religious thinking was derived. His two volumes—*Studies in Mystical Religion*² and *Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries*³—are sufficient testimony of the thoroughness and scholarship with which he tackled the problem. Nevertheless, after long and careful investigation, he felt obliged to confess that nothing more positive could be affirmed than that the possible influences in Fox's environment, for the most part, "worked upon him in subconscious ways, as an atmosphere and climate of his spirit, rather than a clearly conceived body of truth."⁴ This conclusion was tenable so long as Fox was regarded as the founder of the Quakers. It now seems evident, however, by his own admissions, that he was not the founder but simply joined a sect already in existence.⁵ This fact necessitates an attempt to identify the group with which Fox became affiliated.

To sort out the various religious currents of mid-seventeenth century England has seemed to many a hopeless undertaking. It is, to be sure, one of the most confused (and con-

1 William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London, 1912), 35.

2 London, 1909.

3 London, 1914.

4 *Spiritual Reformers*, 343. He makes the same point that Fox's ideas were not consciously adopted in *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 495.

5 Fox dates the beginning of the Quaker movement as 1644, although he did not begin to participate in it until late in 1647. See my essay, "A Suppressed Chapter in Quaker History," to be published in the near future.

fusing) periods in the history of English religion. The Civil Wars had ushered in more than a decade of something approaching a practical religious freedom. The old ecclesiastical authority has been uprooted and the attempts to replace it with a new set of religious controls were not conspicuously successful. The result of this lifting of external restraint in a time of social turmoil was the flowering of all manner of religious ideas and the multiplication of all sorts of religious sects. Furthermore, the groups that did tend to coalesce were unstable at best and were characterized by extreme fluidity. Congregations would be gathered only to divide and then the parts would undergo further division. Individuals followed a similar progression from episcopacy to presbytery, from presbytery to Independency, from Independency to believer's baptism, and from the Baptists to any one of a number of the more leftward sects. Due to these two facts, it is difficult to untangle the threads of the various movements of the time and frequently even more difficult to tell where a specific individual belonged at any particular moment. On the other hand, the success which rewarded the efforts of Perry Miller to clarify the situation with regard to the Independents⁶ encourages one to believe that the confusion with regard to the other groups may also be clarified.

I.

There were at least four clearly recognized major mystical groups, besides the Quakers, in existence during the period of the Civil Wars and the Commonwealth—the Seekers, the Ranters, the Familists, and the Behmenists. The first two can be dismissed at once so far as the present inquiry is concerned. Although the Friends were frequently accused of being Ranters, they had but few things in common with them and always regarded them with an attitude of bitter hostility. The Ranters were believers in an indwelling God who rejected a dualistic interpretation of the universe in favor of a monistic view. This rejection made possible all manner of excess and immorality, which horrified the early Quakers and from which they were saved by their dualistic view. The Seekers, strictly speaking, were not mystics at all, although they did betray some mystical

⁶ *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts* (Cambridge, 1933).

tendencies and provided the Quakers with many of their recruits. A fundamental difference in point of view separated the two groups. The Seekers were waiting for new ecclesiastical forms to be established in a new apostolic dispensation, while the Friends had repudiated external forms entirely and were worshipping under the direct ministry of the Spirit.

The other two groups have been seriously suggested as exerting a very direct influence upon the Quakers. Henry More in 1656 insisted the "Quakers took their original from Behmenism and Familism," while Baxter a year earlier coupled Quakers and Familists in one place and Quakers and Behmenists in another.⁷ Rufus Jones tends to support both these contentions to a certain degree. "There can be no question, for anyone who carefully studies the facts," he writes of the Familists, "that there is much truth in their claim, as reported by Evelyn, that they were 'a sort of Quakers,'"⁸ and he feels that the ideas of Jakob Boehme were an exceedingly important formative factor in Fox's thinking.⁹

It is one thing to suggest influence, either direct or indirect, being exerted; it is quite another matter to posit the identity of two groups. While there were many similarities between the Friends and the Familists, there were also many points of divergence, both in doctrine and organization. The testimony of Thomas Barcroft of Colne, a Familist who became a Quaker, appears to provide conclusive evidence—if evidence is needed—that the two groups maintained separate existences. About 1656 he wrote a treatise

chiefly for the service of those with whom I have had in times past sweet society and union in spirit, in the days of that glimmering of light under the ministry of Brierley, Tonnan, and some few more, whose memories I honour,—called then by the professors of the world Grindletonians, An-

7 Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 40.

8 *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 447.

9 "No careful student of both writers can doubt that there was some sort of influence, direct or indirect, conscious or unconscious" (*Spiritual Reformers*, 220). It ought to be said, however, that many of the parallels he finds between the two men seem rather exaggerated and overdrawn. He says, for example, that Fox's great vision of an Ocean of Darkness and an Ocean of Light "is profoundly like Boehm's fundamental insight that there are two world-principles of Light and Darkness" (*ibid.*, 226). Winstanley not only makes this same fundamental distinction but uses the word "ocean" as well. *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley*, ed. George H. Sabine (Ithaca, N. Y., 1941), 219, 225. In almost every instance, closer parallels may be found in the English interpreters of Sebastian Franck than in Boehme's interpretation of Franck's religious ideas.

tinomians, Heretics, Sectaries, and such-like names of reproach, as in these days . . . the Children of light are in scorn called Quakers.¹⁰

Nor are the Quakers to be identified with the Behmenist sect. John Pordage, the chief leader of the Behmenists, disliked the Quakers, spoke slightly of them, and wrote against them, while the Quakers in turn denounced the Behmenists with equal vigor, particularly because of their retention of the two ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper.¹¹ The division separating the two movements is illustrated by the attitude of Justice Durant Hotham of Yorkshire toward Fox. He was in sympathy with Fox's general point of view but not in wholehearted agreement, and he did not become an adherent to the Quaker cause.¹²

The possibility that there was a fifth group, hereto undistinguished from the others, does not seem to have occurred to anyone, and yet, almost certainly, such a group did exist. As early as 1650, when Fox was still no more than a local disturber of the religious peace of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, the Baptists of London felt obliged to condemn those who held that what is told concerning the death of Christ at Jerusalem is "mere history and shadow," that "the scriptures are but a letter," and that the ordinances are "but fleshly forms" to be replaced by "a God within, and a Christ within, and a word within."¹³ This, of course, is Quaker—not Familist or Behmenist—doctrine, but it is hard to imagine that the Baptists of London were so seriously disturbed by the heresy of a young man in the Nottingham gaol. Far more likely to be of concern to them would be the sermons and writings of Giles Randall,¹⁴ William Dell,¹⁵ John Saltmarsh, and Gerrard Winstanley, for the views of

10 Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 24.

11 Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, 230-33.

12 *The Journal of George Fox*, ed. Norman Penney (2 vols.; Cambridge, 1911), I, 18.

13 *Heart-Bleedings for Professors Abominations* (1650), reprinted in E. B. Underhill, ed., *Confessions of Faith . . . of the Baptist Churches of England* (London, 1854), 295. Pagitt, in his *Heresiographie* (1645), lists "Quakers" among his heresies, but these are not to be identified with the group that developed into the modern Quakers, for the ecstatic feature of trembling was not introduced among them until 1648. *Journal of George Fox* (2 vols.; London, 1827), I, 91. Apparently Pagitt's group was a sect of women at Southwark who came from beyond the sea. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 57.

14 His words "sound strangely like the yet unborn Quakers" (Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, 263).

15 "William Dell has often been taken for a Quaker. His works are frequently catalogued in lists of Quaker books, and they have been published by Quaker publishers and widely circulated among Friends" (Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 488).

these men were characterized not merely by a few striking parallels to Fox's thought but were in all essential respects identical with it. Randall had been preaching for some years with great success in London; Dell and Saltmarsh were noted for their sermons at army headquarters;¹⁶ and Winstanley—prior to his venture at "digging"—very likely had been carrying on an itinerant ministry in the midland and central countries.

The fact that these men were proclaiming a common message does not suggest to Jones that any relationship existed between them. "It seems to me," he writes, "that Saltmarsh, Dell, Winstanley, and Fox were all the product of peculiar social and spiritual conditions, and that they came independently of each other to quite similar views and experiences."¹⁷ To accept such a conclusion, even with no further evidence, requires a considerable degree of credulity. Fortunately there are other indications that the religious views of these men did not develop in complete isolation from one another. Saltmarsh and Dell were together at Fairfax's headquarters, and Winstanley seems to have been confident that he would receive a sympathetic hearing from the general.¹⁸ Of even greater significance is the fact that Giles Calvert, who kept shop at the sign of the Black Spread-Eagle at the west end of Pauls near Ludgate, was the publisher of the works of Saltmarsh, Dell, Winstanley, and the Quakers.¹⁹ Without question this constituted a very tangible point of contact, and around this common center there undoubtedly occurred considerable interchange of ideas and mutual influence.

A loosely defined body of adherents seems to have taken shape around the doctrines of these men, and the names by which their converts were called are the same as those later used by the Quakers. Randall, for example, speaks of a translation of the *Theologia Germanica* which had been circulating in manuscript among "lovers of Truth" and "well-wishers to

16 Baxter says that "Saltmarsh and Dell were the two great preachers at the Headquarters" (*ibid.*, 489). Dell had preached before the House of Commons in 1646.

17 *Ibid.*, 495.

18 "We are assured of your moderation and friendship to us" (*A Letter to the Lord Fairfax* (1649), *Works*, 285).

19 Calvert also published John Jackson's *A Sober Word to a Serious People* (1651) and Thomas Higgenson's *Glory Sometimes Afar Off* (1653), and these two men may have been members of this group of Puritan mystics. Jackson seems to have been wrongly classified by most writers as a Seeker. Another publication of the group seems to have been the anonymous tract *The Life and Light of a Man in Christ Jesus* (1646).

Truth," and he called himself "a lover of the Truth in the Truth."²⁰ Winstanley repeatedly calls his followers "Friends" and himself a "Friend to Freedom," or a "Friend to Love," or simply a "Friend."²¹ The most distinctive term, however, which seems to have been used by no other group, is the name by which the Quakers were first known—"Children of the Light." Winstanley uses it in *The Breaking of the Day of God*²² and in *Truth Lifting Up Its Head Above Scandal*,²³ while Randall says in his Preface to *A Bright Starre* (1646) that the book will have "good success amongst the *Children of the Light*."²⁴ Sir Henry Vane, the younger, also uses the term "Children of the Light"²⁵ and it is probable that he became an adherent of this group. This supposition would give added meaning to Fox's comment when he was rebuffed by Vane in 1657: "Thou hast knowne somethinge formerly; but now there is a mountain of earth and imaginations uppe in thee and from that rises a smoake which has darkened thy braine: and thou art not the man as thou wert formerly."²⁶

Much work still remains to be done before one can speak with assurance concerning the existence of this group of Puritan mystics who antedated Fox and anticipated his message, but the basic outline is clear. Our present interest, how-

20 Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, 256, 260.

21 *Works*, 125, 281, 337, 362, 403, 421, 439, 440, 448. See also *The Saints Paradise*, addressed to "my Beloved Friends whose souls hunger after sincere milk," where the term frequently appears.

22 "You that are the Children of the Light must lie under the reproach and oppression of the world . . . But it shall be but for a little time. What I have here to say is to bring you glad tidings that your redemption draws near" (Lewis H. Berens, *The Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth* [London, 1906], 54). These words are addressed to "The Despised Sons and Daughters of Zion, scattered up and down the Kingdom of England." Jones says that they are evidence of "the existence of a waiting, seeking people" to whom Winstanley "promises that the day of relief is near" (*Studies in Mystical Religion*, 490). But far from being "Seekers," they were already "finders." They had the "power of God" within them, and they were simply waiting for Fox's "Day of the Lord" when persecution would cease.

23 "Every sonne and daughter as they are called children of light, have light within themselves" (*Works*, 127). In *The New Law of Righteousness*, Winstanley says that "the Saints are called, Children of the day, not of the night" (*ibid.*, 237). Here he used "day" instead of "light" because he wished to make a play on words. The "priests" should be "dayvines" rather than "divines," or "Diviners, witches, sorcerers, deceivers" (*Ibid.*, 242). It is interesting to note that Francis Howgil, a Quaker leader, entitled one of his tracts *Truth Lifting Up Its Head Above Slander*.

24 Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, 259.

25 *Ibid.*, 277.

26 *Journal*, ed. Penney, I, 314.

ever, is in Gerrard Winstanley who seems to provide the connecting link with Fox.

II.

Practically everyone who has ever read any of Winstanley's writings has been astonished at their amazing similarity to Quaker publications. Sabine, for example, says that passages from the Quaker writers

could be transplanted into one of Winstanley's tracts without producing the least sense of incongruity . . . The resemblance . . . is astonishingly close . . . It is closest of all perhaps in the case of George Fox himself, whose sense of "Christ within," of worship as communion with God, and of such communion as an inward source of serenity and energy seems almost identical with Winstanley's conception of religion.²⁷

Edward Berstein and G. P. Gooch, led astray by the misdating of Winstanley's *Saints Paradice*, were positive that he became a Quaker after the failure of his communistic experiment,²⁸ while Carlyle, commenting upon Winstanley's refusal to remove his hat in Fairfax's presence, remarked: "The germ of Quakerism and much else is curiously visible here."²⁹ It is not surprising, therefore, that Winstanley has been suggested from time to time as the true father of the Friends. As early as 1678, Thomas Comber in *Christianity No Enthusiasm* called the Quakers "Winstanley's Disciples," and wrote concerning them: "For their original, it may seem more difficult to discover, where sects are not called after their Founder, but after some property, etc. . . . But the very draughts and even the body of Quakerism are to be found in the several works of Gerrard Winstanley."³⁰ Twenty-two years later, Thomas Bennet, in *An Answer to the Dissenters' Pleas for Separation*, speaks of the time "when Winstanley published the principles of Quakerism, and enthusiasm broke out."³¹

Unfortunately the historians of Quakerism have failed to

27 Winstanley, *Works*, 34. Even Jones says of Winstanley that "he was the most like Fox in type of mind and bent of nature of any of the great Quaker's contemporaries" (*Studies in Mystical Religion*, 493.)

28 This conclusion was an inference based upon the erroneous date assigned to *The Saints Paradice* in the catalogue of the Thomason Library. It was dated 1658 instead of 1648. Winstanley, *Works*, 11.

29 Berens, *The Digger Movement*, 38. Saltmarsh also retained his hat before Fairfax. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 483.

30 Berens, *The Digger Movement*, 49 f.

31 *Ibid.*, 49. Berens is perhaps the most recent writer to give voice to this suspicion.

follow up the lead provided by these men and have been too ready to deny the probability of any direct influence having been exerted, to say nothing of the possibility of an even more definite relationship having existed between Winstanley and Fox. "I cannot agree with L. H. Berens," declared Jones, "that the founders of the Society of Friends 'adopted almost in their entirety' the views of Winstanley. I very much doubt whether Winstanley in any degree influenced Fox. There is to my mind no sign of it."³² Misled by such statements, non-Quaker historians have had to content themselves with noting the startling paradox of resemblance in the writings of the two men and then confess that even such a "high degree of similarity carries no implication of direct influence."³³

Within the scope of this article it is not possible to make an analysis of the fundamental agreement which exists in the religious thought of Winstanley and Fox, but such an analysis is scarcely necessary, for the parallels between the two men are generally admitted.³⁴ For our purpose, it should be sufficient to note that practically every idea and concept that conceivably could have been in Fox's mind prior to 1660 can be duplicated in Winstanley. The only exceptions seem to be the use of *thee* and *thou*, the opposition to oaths,³⁵ and the insistence upon the quaking experience as evidence of regeneration which was a Foxian innovation. Not only were the two men in complete agreement theologically and characterized by the same social sensitivity; they and their adherents were regarded in the same light by the "world." Both Winstanley and Fox had to defend themselves against the charge of Ranterism and the accusation of denying God, Christ, the scriptures, and the ordinances. Members of both groups—if there were two groups—were im-

32 *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 11.

33 Winstanley, *Works*, 11.

34 A good summary of Winstanley's religious thought has been made by Sabine in his Introduction to Winstanley's *Works*, 36-51. To only one statement would I offer a qualified dissent. Winstanley, says Sabine, "saw no need even for that minimum of organization by which Fox preserved the Quakers as a recognizable religious body" (*ibid.*, 47). It was, of course, not earlier than 1652 that Fox began to perceive the need for organization. There is no satisfactory exposition of Fox's religious thinking, since all of them tend to ignore the eschatological framework in which his thought was cast. For the most part, they are analyses of Bareley's reconstruction of the Quaker message.

35 Winstanley may have been opposed to oaths, even though he does not mention the fact in his writings. It is only from the reports of others that we know of his refusal to do "hat-honor." Nevertheless, it is likely that opposition to the taking of oaths was introduced by Fox.

prisoned for blasphemy and had their livelihood endangered by the refusal of the "children of the flesh" to buy and sell with them.³⁶

One parallel, hitherto unnoticed, perhaps ought to be mentioned. In Winstanley's proposed constitution for an ideal commonwealth—*The Law of Freedom in a Platform*—one is surprised to discover that the Quaker marriage and burial practices are advocated.³⁷ Winstanley does not mention the practice of having parents name their children in the presence of the midwife instead of having them christened, which Penn couples with the other two customs,³⁸ but he does give at least one reason—and perhaps the fundamental reason—why the conventional rites at birth, marriage, and death were rejected. In *The New Law of Righteousness*, he writes:

They that stand up to teach others, they teach for gain, and preach for hire. . . . A man must not take a wife, but the Priest must give her him. If he have a child, the Priest must give the name. If any die, the Priest must see it laid in the earth. . . . What is the end of all this, but to get money: if a man labour in the earth to eat his bread, the Priest must have the tenths of his encrease.³⁹

Rufus Jones, after pointing out some of the similarities in the views of the two men, adds in a foot-note that "the careful reader will, however, note that the contrasts between Winstanley and Fox are fully as marked as are the similarities."⁴⁰ Aside from Winstanley's communistic doctrines, which are not to be found in his earlier theological writings, the suggested contrasts are not easy to discover, even by a careful reader, and Jones does not inform us as to what they are. Elsewhere he gives as one of the distinctive features of the Quakers that they were "somewhat more emphatic than were their spiritual fore-runners . . . in their declaration that this Seed, this Light, is

36 *Journal*, ed., Penney, I, 138. Winstanley, *Works*, 152.

37 "When any man or woman are consented to live together in marriage, they shall acquaint all the Overseers in their Circuit therewith, and some other neighbors; and being all met together, the man shall declare by his own mouth before them all, that he takes that woman to be his wife, and the woman shall say the same, and desire the Overseers to be Witnesses" (*ibid.*, 599). "When a dead person is to be buried, the Officers of the Parish and neighbors shall go along with the Corpse to the grave and see it laid therein, in a civil manner; but the publique Minister nor any other shall have any hand in reading or Exhortation" (*ibid.*, 598). The Quakers ultimately came to permit a word of exhortation if one of those present felt moved by the Spirit.

38 *Journal of George Fox*, 1827 ed., I xviii.

39 Winstanley, *Works*, 187. Both Winstanley and Fox always quote to tithe-taker's the text: "Freely ye have received, freely give."

40 *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 495.

not *natural*.⁴¹ He then proceeds to state the Quaker position in the words of William Penn.

We assert the Light of Christ not to be a Natural Light otherwise than as all men born into the world have a Measure of Christ's Light, and so in a sense it may be called Natural to all Men. But this Light is something else than a bare Understanding which Man hath as a Rational Creature.

Winstanley, however, is equally emphatic that the "light" is from God and far from being inherent in the natural, fleshly, or earthly order, is contaminated by it. The only possible point at which confusion could arise concerning his view is during that brief period when he was using "Reason" as a name for God, but even here he was quick to guard himself against being misunderstood and drew a sharp distinction between the Spirit Reason and "mans reasoning."⁴²

Another feature of Fox's thought, which has been considered as setting him apart from his contemporaries, was his conviction that "the time of 'apostasy' was now at an end, that a new 'commission' had come, that a real Reformation was being set in operation."⁴³ Once again this is one of Winstanley's fundamental insights. Quotations to this effect can be picked almost at random from any of his tracts.⁴⁴ In fact, one has difficulty in understanding what was in the background of Fox's mind in this connection unless the writings of Winstanley are consulted.

Braithwaite suggests that a specific contribution of the Quakers was the two touchstones they utilized in testing the validity of the guidance of the "spirit." The first touchstone

41 *Spiritual Reformers*, 346 f. Rachel H. King makes this same point that in Fox, unlike Winstanley, "the light is thoroughly supernatural. It is not conscience, or the light of nature, or the light of reason" (*George Fox and the Light Within, 1650-1660* [Philadelphia, 1940], 57). This study, unfortunately, is thoroughly unreliable and untrustworthy.

42 So-called human reason "is but a candle lighted" by God, and "this light shining through flesh, is darkened by the imagination of flesh; so that many times men act contrary to reason, though they think they act according to reason. By that light of Reason that is in man, he may see a suitableness in many things, but not in all things. . . . The Spirit Reason, which I call God, the Maker and Ruler of all things is this spiritual power, that guides all mens reasoning in right order, and to a right end" (*Works*, 105). That is to say, to use Winstanley's usual terminology, it is the "light within," the "inward testimony," the "word" that comes from God and is God that gives one "experimental knowledge" in contrast to mere "fleshy knowledge," "imagination," or "notions."

43 Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, 340.

44 See, e. g., *Works*, 121, 124, 149, 152, 163, 189, 205, 230.

was that "no unrighteous or immoral conduct could proceed from the light," and the second was that the reality of spiritual guidance should be tested "by asking whether it pointed to action which crossed the carnal nature."⁴⁵ In Winstanley one finds the same two principles. "I must watch some of you," he says, "to see if your conversation be so universally filled with Love, as shall make the dark world startle; and then I can say of a truth, Christ is risen in you."⁴⁶ His message concerning "digging," he asserted, was of God, since it had caused him to be called "fool, mad man," and to have "many slanderous reports" cast upon him. "I hate none, I love all, . . . I would have none live in poverty, straits or sorrows; therefore if you find any selfishness in this work, or discover any thing that is destructive to the whole Creation, . . . open your hearts freely to me in declaring my weakness."⁴⁷

Rachel H. King, in her doctoral dissertation, *George Fox and the Light Within*, has marshalled a vast array of basic differences in the views of Winstanley and Fox, but she admits quite frankly that she had not read any of Winstanley's writings, even though most of them were available in the libraries she utilized in making her investigation. Consequently, the points she makes cannot be taken too seriously. Her major indictment of Winstanley is that he was a "rationalist" and not a mystic.⁴⁸ Rather than make a point by refutation, it should

45 *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 277 f.

46 He goes on to say: "If your owne eye be darke, that is, if darknesse rule your whole body; then all the actions of your body toward others are in darknesse, . . . which is the one power you yet live in. But if your eye be . . . full of Light, then the Light power rules in you, and the actions of your outward man will be full of Light, and Life, and Love" (*Works*, 478). Elsewhere he says that when the power of light reigns supreme, "humility arises above pride, love above envy, a meek and quiet spirit above hasty rash anger, chastity above unclean lusts" (*ibid.*, 173).

47 *Ibid.*, 291. Elsewhere he says that "self-love to my own particular body does not carry me along in the managing of this business" (*ibid.*, 329).

48 Pp. 24 f. Miss King also speaks of Winstanley's "dependence on human strength to rid the soul of evil" (*ibid.*, 25), but like a constantly reiterated refrain Winstanley says that "the arm of the Lord only shall bring these mighty things to passe" that "the Lord himself will do this great work," that "the Lord alone wil be the healer, the restorer, and the giver" (*Works*, 153, 182, 205). Again she says that "Fox with greater religious insight, always has harmony with God as his primary goal" (*George Fox and the Light Within*, 25), but the goal Winstanley emphasizes in all his writings is "to become one with him [Christ or the Seed] and with his Father" (*Works*, 115), for it is only by being lifted into "onenes" with God that one achieves unity with the Creation or Mankind (*ibid.*, 111, 117, 120, etc.). Once more she writes that Fox "interprets the Bible without resorting to allegory" (*George Fox and the Light Within*, 168), but even the casual reader ought to discern that his entire message rests ultimately upon Franck's allegorical interpretation of scripture.

be sufficient to place over against her contention the estimate arrived at by Sabine.

The essence of Winstanley's "experimental" religion . . . was intuition or vision of a mystical sort, precisely such as George Fox describes as the "openings" of the Lord to him. The intuitions were to his mind, as to Fox's, completely self-authenticating, and therefore radically different from the "imaginary" knowledge of books, or authority, or tradition, or of logical inference.⁴⁹

The unique element in Fox, according to Miss King, is his definition of the "light within" as "that which shows a man evil" and "that in which is unity."⁵⁰ Once again Winstanley has anticipated Fox. The light, he affirms, "doth testifie of you, that your *deeds are evil*," and its function is to knit "every creature together into a oneness; making every creature to be an upholder of his fellow; and so every one is an assistant to preserve the whole."⁵¹

Not only were the religious views of Winstanley indentical with those of Fox, but at many points it is practically impossible to understand Fox's meaning until one reads Winstanley. A glaring example of this is to be found in an attempt to systematize Fox's concept of hell. Miss King devotes ten pages of her book to seeking to resolve the seemingly inherent contradictions in his thinking with regard to the future estate of sinners, and then concludes that "it is only with some effort that a belief in hell is fitted into his general view."⁵² Fox, of course, "does not point out these difficulties into which his belief would lead him," for he was not a systematic theologian. Systematic theologian or not, it would have been much better to say that he does not point out the difficulties for the simple reason that they do not exist, as Miss King would have discovered had she read the eleventh chapter of Winstanley's *New Law of Righteousness*.⁵³

Numerous other illustrations of similar confusion concerning Fox's meaning could be cited, but four or five should be sufficient to establish the point. Fox's reference to persons going "into the earth" is meaningful only against the background of the doctrine that the earth was corrupted, and is still being corrupted, by the "first Adam," dwelling in man, who delights

49 Winstanley, *Works*, 10.

50 *George Fox and the Light Within*, 38.

51 *Works*, 211, 105.

52 *George Fox and the Light Within*, 133.

53 *Works*, 215-223. See also 132 f., 211.

"in and upon the objects of the earth."⁵⁴ Winstanley also gives us the clue as to why Fox had to know the "nature of Beasts" before he could speak to all conditions,⁵⁵ and he gives definitions of the three "states" of man which make it possible to understand what Fox meant by a "more steadfast state than Adam's in innocence, . . . a state in Christ Jesus, that should never fall."⁵⁶ The practice of Quakers "going naked as a sign" also has been confusing. Braithwaite say that they did this "to show that Cromwell, his Parliament and priests would be stripped of their power," although Fox had said that it meant that they were "not covered with truth."⁵⁷ One would suspect, owing to their emphasis on the Genesis story, that it might have something to do with Adam's nakedness in the Garden, but this seemingly would make it a sign of their own innocence. Again the solution is to be found in Winstanley, particularly in the second chapter of *Fire in the Bush*. Adam's nakedness came from surrendering to the temptation of the Serpent and became apparent to him when God sat in judgment upon him. That judgment was now approaching for all men and when it comes "every thing shall appear naked, and bare before the Lord of the whole Earth, and all Imaginary coverings shall be taken off every where."⁵⁸

Perhaps the least understood and most neglected phase of Fox's thinking is "the terrible day of the Lord" which stood at the center of his message. On that day, he says, "all hearts shall be made manifest, and the secrets of every one's heart shall be revealed by the light," and it "shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, and all that do wickedly, shall be as stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up."⁵⁹ Fox never goes much beyond this in defining his "day of the Lord," except to indicate that it was based upon the prophesies "of things to come" in the book of Revelation.⁶⁰ Winstanley, on the other hand, gives the

54 *Ibid.*, 113, 117.

55 *Ibid.*, 157.

56 *Ibid.*, 478-84.

57 Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 151, 148.

58 *Works*, 457. "This now is the cool of the day; and the heate of opposition betweene flesh and Spirit begins to decline; flesh sees his folly. . . . And that righteous Ruler (God) . . . begins to walke . . . in the middle of the garden (Man's heart); the sweet breathings of that pure spirit is now entertained, and falne Earth begins to see himselfe naked, and to acknowledge his nakednesse before the spirit" (*ibid.*, 460).

59 *Journal*, 1827 ed., I, 287, 117.

60 *Ibid.*, 81.

complete details concerning the inauguration and events of the "day." The forty-two months mentioned in Revelation, he said, were expiring and the people of his day were "under the half day of the Beast, or the dividing of time" when Christ was to come again.⁶¹ He had, in fact, already made his second appearance in many "sons and daughters" and was soon to "restore the unity of the whole Creation."⁶² The day of the Lord was at hand, when the "light" or "Christ within" would sit as a "Righteous Judge . . . upon the Throne in every man or woman,"⁶³ in "every family that lives after the flesh,"⁶⁴ and let them "in his light" see themselves to be devils.⁶⁵ Then the Lord (Christ within) shall condemn and put "the Serpent to death every where" and "subdue all his enemies under his feet."⁶⁶ This, of course, will be added torment for the sinner, for the

body of sin [the Serpent] and the flesh is so nearly wrapped in each other, that before the spirit hath parted them, thou shalt roar in bitterness and wish thou hadst never been born; and the more familiarity thou hast had with thy cursed lust, the sharper will thy torments be; the founder cannot burn away the drosse, but must burn the gold too in the fire.⁶⁷

With the dross burned away and the Serpent destroyed, Christ "wil dwel and rule in every one . . . ; every single body . . . a star shining forth of him, or rather a body in and out of whome he shines,"⁶⁸ and

tender grasse will cover the earth, the Spirit wil cover al places *with the abundance of fruit*, that flows from himself, young and old shal al honour the Lord, and be taught of no other but him; the wheat fields which is the best grain (the Fathers own people) shall flourish abundantly; the bondage of beastly Ceremonies, forms, customs, abominable actings in unrighteousness shal cease, there shal be lesse talking, preaching, prating, and more righteous acting: *The voice of mourning shall be heard no more, the birds shall sing merrily on every bough.*⁶⁹

Enough has been said to indicate that it is no mere superficial resemblance that marks the religious thought of Win-

61 *Works*, 205.

62 *Ibid.*, 152, 162.

63 *Ibid.*, 206

64 *Ibid.*, 217.

65 *Ibid.*, 220. "All flesh shall see it self in its own colors; and when the flesh doth see it self in his own beastly shapes, he will appear so deformed, so piteous a confused chaos of miserie and shame, that the sight thereof shall be a great torment to himself" (*ibid.*, 223).

66 *Ibid.*, 230.

67 *Ibid.*, 132-33.

68 *Ibid.*, 225

69 *Ibid.*, 207-08.

stanley and Fox. Their messages were identical and obviously most intimately related. The question which now must be answered is whether Winstanley could have been responsible for the formation of the mystical communities which sprang up in Leicestershire in 1644, in Warwickshire in 1645, in Nottinghamshire in 1646, in Derbyshire in 1647, and developed ultimately into the modern Society of Friends. This was the movement with which Fox had allied himself in Nottinghamshire late in 1647.

III.

The little that is known concerning Winstanley's life has been brought together by George H. Sabine.⁷⁰ Apparently he was born at Wigan in Lancashire in 1609, and his parents may have had some means.⁷¹ At the beginning of the Civil Wars he was engaged in some phase of the cloth industry in London, had been admitted to the liberty of the City, and was probably a member of one of the City Companies. As a consequence of the financial distress produced by the conflict, he soon found himself bankrupt, and was "forced to accept the good will of friends crediting of me to live a Countrey-life."⁷² The place in the country to which he retired, Berens believes to have been the little town of Colnbrook in southern Buckinghamshire, within seven miles of St. George's Hill in Surrey,⁷³ but Sabine thinks he accepted the hospitality of friends in Surrey, since he was in Kingston when Francis Drake took the Covenant, presumably in 1643.⁷⁴ It is not of great importance, however, whether he went to Buckinghamshire or Surrey, for within a short time he again found the "burden of Taxes and much Free-Quarter" heavier than his weak back could bear.⁷⁵

It is a plausible conjecture that the next few years of Winstanley's life were spent wandering from place to place in the

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 5-11.

⁷¹ "My health and estate is decayed, and I grow in age, I must either beg or work for day wages, which I was never brought up to" (*ibid.*, 575).

⁷² *Ibid.*, 315.

⁷³ *The Digger Movement*, 79. Berens fails to give his reason for this conjecture, but presumably it rests upon his identification of Winstanley as the author of *Light Shining in Buckinghamshire* (1648), *More Light Shining in Buckinghamshire* (London, 1649), and *A Declaration from the Welaffecte in the County of Buckinghamshire* (1649). Sabine, however, says that it is "practically certain that he could not have been the author" of these works (Winstanley, *Works*, 605).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 325-26.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 315.

midland and central counties as an itinerant publisher of "truth."⁷⁶ On any other basis, it would be difficult to account for the works of counsel, comfort, and instruction which he wrote to groups of "Children of the Light," "Beloved Friends whose souls hunger after sincere milk," and "Despised Sons and Daughters of Zion, scattered up and down the Kingdom of England." He himself affirms that it was his custom to hold forth truth to his fellow creatures as occasion offered and as the "light" was pleased to manifest itself in him,⁷⁷ and he implies that he did move about to some extent.⁷⁸ Furthermore, it is reported that he "invaded" Fox's home parish, Fenny Dayton in Leicestershire and became involved in controversy with Fox's arch-antagonist, Nathaniel Stephens.⁷⁹

In 1649, however, Winstanley was in Surrey making a precarious living by pasturing his neighbor's cattle. Early in this year, while in a trance, he had received a revelation which gave his message a new twist. Side by side with his former emphasis on the "Community of Mankind," he now emphasized the "Community of the Earth."⁸⁰ The essence of his revelation was that the earth should be made "a common Treasury" for the benefit of all, and Winstanley was directed to declare it all abroad.⁸¹ This he proceeded to do by word of mouth, by

76 This was a common practice among the Baptists, and Winstanley had been a Baptist.

77 *Ibid.*, 140, 141, 155, 194.

78 He speaks of declaring his revelation concerning the "common Treasurie" of the earth "by word of mouth wheresoever I came" (*ibid.*, 315).

79 *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Sidney Lee. Vol. LIV (New York, 1898), 179. Stephens, in *A Plain and Easie Calculation of the Name, Mark, and Number of the Beast* (London, 1656), says that Winstanley's *New Law of Righteousness* was still in circulation among mystical persons of his acquaintance. Winstanley, *Works*, 34.

80 For his definition of these terms, see his *Works*, 386.

81 *Ibid.*, 104, 315. It seems probable that Winstanley had been influenced by the fusion that had taken place, across the river in Buckinghamshire, between the equalitarian ideas of his religious mysticism and the political principles of the Levellers, which resulted in a vigorous opposition to enclosures, and ultimately was transformed by Winstanley into a radical communistic emphasis. It seems almost certain that this Buckinghamshire group was one of Winstanley's mystical communities, for in their first publication (*Light Shining in Buckinghamshire*) they echo many of his phrases, call themselves "friends" and "children of light," and speak somewhat detachedly, though approvingly, of the Levellers (Winstanley, *Works*, 614). The Leveller agitation had begun in the fall of 1647 and sometime thereafter their principles had filtered into the thinking of the Buckinghamshire mystics. The blend produced something entirely new. It was no longer Leveller doctrine, and the political programme was far from their original position as "children of light." This latter inconsistency, however, was to be harmonized by Winstanley. The Buckinghamshire group had no plan for the communal tilling of the soil, but their ideas were such as would

writing, and later by "digging" and planting the common land as a sign of the great work to be wrought by the Lord.⁸²

The involved story of Winstanley's communistic venture at St. George's Hill in Surrey need not concern us here. It is sufficient to note that he sought to win the "Children of Light" to his new emphasis.⁸³ At the same time, principally in Nottinghamshire, George Fox was seeking to win the movement over to his insistence upon "quaking" as evidence of the "power of God." Fox encountered considerable difficulty in securing support for his innovation and it was not until he forsook his old haunts and went north into Yorkshire, Lancaster, and Westmorland that he met with any great success. We may surmise that Winstanley had similar difficulty in converting the "friends" to his new point of view. Whatever success he did have must have been in the counties through which the "digger" agents passed soliciting funds for the project at St. George's Hill—Surrey, Buckinghamshire, Northamptonshire, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, and Berkshire.⁸⁴ It has been noted elsewhere that the reports from Leicestershire, Warwickshire, Nottinghamshire, and Derbyshire in *The First Publishers of Truth*⁸⁵ were suppressed, ignored, or lost when the documents were first compiled, and it may be significant that the reports from Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, and Surrey

suggest it to a fertile mind, and they later endorsed the "digging" project (*ibid.*, 647).

82 The dramatic declaration of the revelation by action may have been the suggestion of William Everard. At least he took the lead in the project for the first three or four weeks. After that his name disappears and he was reported to have joined the Leveller rebellion which ended in defeat at Burford on May 14, 1649. *Ibid.*, 103 f., 641. Prior to the "digging" venture, Everard had been associated with Winstanley and had been put in prison at Kingston for blasphemy. Winstanley wrote *Truth Lifting Up Its Head Above Scandal* to vindicate both Everard and himself. *Ibid.*, 103.

83 "Knowing that the Spirit of righteousness does appear in many in this Land, I desire all of you seriously in love and humility, to consider of this business of publike community, which I am carried forth in the power of love, and clear light of universall righteousness, to advance as much as I can" (*ibid.*, 291). Winstanley then proceeds to demonstrate to them that his revelation was of God because of the slander and fury that it had created against him; hence there could be no "selfishness in this work." Unfortunately, so far as the reconstruction of the internal history of the larger movement is concerned, Winstanley addressed his writings, subsequent to the new revelation, to the "world"—to the House of Commons, to the City of London, to the Army, to the "Several Societies . . . Called Churches," to the teachers at the universities, and to the lawyers at the Inns of the Court.

84 *Ibid.*, 441. "Digging" was also undertaken at Wellingborough in Northamptonshire and in Kent. *Ibid.*, 411, 649-51.

85 Ed. Norman Penney (London, 1907).

are also missing.⁸⁶ It seems safe to assume, at least, that the Fox faction would have been as anxious to suppress evidence of relationship to the "diggers" as they were to disavow any connection with the movement as a whole and thus be able to portray themselves as starting *de novo*, springing directly from the unique revelation of God to George Fox.

Winstanley's communist message did not win any great response. His tilling of the common land was destined from the beginning to arouse such opposition that it could not be long continued.⁸⁷ Some eighteen months after the failure of the "digging" venture, he made one last attempt to realize his dream of a communistic society. This was the publication of his *Law of Freedom in a Platform*, the proposed constitution of his ideal commonwealth, which he urged Cromwell to put into effect. Apparently he had become somewhat disillusioned in his millenarian expectation and was willing to place more dependence upon changes in outward laws and institutions. After this final appeal of 1652, Winstanley's pen was laid aside and presumably he retired from the field of religious and social propaganda. In 1660 he was still living at Cobham in Surrey, and, as Sabine points out, the fact that he was able to institute a suit in Chancery in that year indicates that he must have achieved a moderate degree of prosperity.

86 *Ibid.*, 12, 128, 168, 231.

87 It actually lasted a little more than a year.

MUSIC IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH BEFORE AND AT THE TIME OF J. S. BACH

RICHARD SCHOENBOHM

Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana.

Those who had once experienced the power and blessedness of the Gospel as revealed by Luther felt that he had restored to them a lost treasure greater than all worldly riches. So it is in the work of Luther that we find the roots of Lutheran church music. The story of carrying over the old in music and tracing its influence in the new era is an unending maze of facts and conjectures, none the less interesting, however. This new church body would become distinctive in its music. It would substitute for the ritualistic and even pantomimical where every feature of the architecture, of the altar, and environment, as well as the liturgic services, symbolized religion, a new vitality, direct interest, and instructiveness. This would mean a breaking away from that form of church services where reverence is voiced by every appeal to eye and ear, where one would feel himself verily to be in the House of Prayer and before the throne of the Holy One.

The musical system of the Catholic church proceeded from the Gregorian chant which is strictly a detail of the sacerdotal office.¹ The Lutheran music, on the contrary, is based primarily on the congregational hymn. The one is clerical, the other laic; the one official, prescribed, liturgic, unalterable; the other free, spontaneous, and democratic.² Where the Catholic church had been consistent in withdrawing the office of song from the laity and assigning it to a separate group, or minor clergy, the Protestant church was to give the laity the gift of worshiping their God through participation in congregational singing. Naturally, the people's song of the early Protestantism had a militant ring. It was a sort of spiritual *Triumphlied*, proclaiming to the universe that the day of spiritual emancipation had dawned.

Protestant writers have, as a rule, bestowed unstinted praise

¹ E. Diekinson, *Music in the History of Western Church* (New York, 1902), p. 223.
² *Ibid.*

upon Luther as the man who first gave the people a voice with which to utter their religious emotions in song. Most of these writers are disposed to make little account of the existence of a popular religious song in Germany before the Reformation. Catholic writers, on the other hand, will allow Luther no originality, give him credit only for his cleverness in dressing up his borrowed ideas and forms in a popular guise.³ The truth is that Luther, in poetry, music, and the several details of church worship recast the old modes and gave them to his followers with contents purified and adapted to those needs which he himself had made them realize. We do him justice by honoring his practical wisdom.

Lutheran hymnody did not begin with Luther. In Wackernagel⁴ there is a collection of German hymns from the earliest times to the beginning of the seventeenth century. Luther charged the popular hymnody of the day with the energy of his world-transforming doctrine, and also gave it a dignity it had never possessed since the apostolic age, as a part of the official liturgical song of the church. The song both symbolized and realized the principle of the direct access of the believer to the Father.⁵ In addition to this, he gave of his own composition numerous powerful hymns, which were a witness to the great truths which were the corner-stone of the doctrine of the reformed church. The friends as well as the enemies of the Reformation asserted that the spread of the new doctrine was due more to Luther's hymns than to his sermons.

Luther's labor in this field was not confined to the chorale, but, like the founders of the musical service of the Anglican church, he established a system of chanting, taking the Roman use as a model, and transferring many of the Gregorian tunes. Johann Walther, Luther's co-laborer, relates the extreme pains which Luther took in setting music to the Epistle, Gospel, and other offices of the service. He intended to institute a threefold division of church song—the choir anthem, the unison chant, and the congregational hymn. Only the first and third forms have been retained. The rage for turning creeds, commandments, psalms, and everything to be sung into metre gradually

³ *Ibid.*, p. 227.

⁴ P. Wackernagel, *Das Deutsche Kirchenlied von der aeltesten zeit bis zu Anfang des XVII Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1864).

⁵ Dickinson, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

banished the chant from Protestant communities on the continent.

Tracing the development of the hymn briefly, we find that the secular folksong of the 16th century was a very prolific source of the German chorale. This was after Luther's day, for it does not appear that any of his tunes were of this class.⁶ The associations of the secular tunes were not always the most edifying, and many theologians protested against them.

The choral tunes in Luther's time were at first not harmonized. Then, as they began to be set in the strict contrapuntal style of the day, it became the custom for the people to sing the melody while the choir sustained the other parts. The melody was at first in the tenor, according to time honored usage in artistic music, but as composers found that they must consider the vocal limitations of a mass of untrained singers, a simpler form of harmony was introduced, and the custom arose of putting the melody in the upper voice and the harmony below. This method prepared the development of a harmony that was more in the nature of modern chord progressions, and when the choir and congregation severed their incompatible union, the complex counterpoint in which the age delighted was allowed free range in the motet, while the harmonized chorale became more simple and compact. The partnership of choir and congregation was dissolved about 1600, and the organ took the place of the trained singers in accompanying the unison song of the people.⁷

One who studies the German chorales as they appear in the hymnbooks of the present day must not suppose that he is acquainted with the religious tunes of the Reformation in their pristine form. As they are now sung in German and American services, they have been greatly modified in harmony and rhythm, and, even in many instances, in melody. The only scale and harmonic system then in vogue was the Gregorian. In respect to rhythm, the alterations have been equally striking. The present chorale is usually written in notes of equal length, one note to a syllable. The metre is in most cases double, rarely triple. This manner gives the chorale a singularly grave, solid, and stately character. There was far more life in the primitive chorale; movement was more flexible, and the frequent groups

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 261.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

of notes to a single syllable imparted a buoyancy and warmth that are unknown to the rigid modern form. The transformation of the chorale into its present shape was completed in the eighteenth century.⁸

The multiplication of hymns and chorales went on throughout the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth with unabated vigor, and in the first half of the seventeenth century, a large number of the most beautiful songs of the German church were contributed by such men as Andreas Hammerschmidt, Johann Crueger, J. R. Ahle, Johann Schop, Melchior Franck, Michael Altenburg.

The Lutheran church entered the seventeenth century with three strong forms of music to its credit, the chorale, the motet, and organ music. Over against these stood the Italian recitative and aria, associated with the new principles of tonality, harmony, and structure. A group in the Lutheran church, basing their culture upon the old German choir or chorus, organ music, and people's hymn tunes, grafted upon this sturdy stock the Italian melody. They did not retain too much of the old or throw away too much of the new, but adopted what was soundest and most suitable for these ends in the art of both countries, and built up a form of music which strove to preserve the high traditions of national liturgical song and satisfy tastes which had been stimulated by recent rapid advances in musical invention. Out of this grew the Passion music and the Cantata of the 18th century, embellished with all the expressive resources of the Italian vocal solo and the orchestral accompaniment, solidified by a contrapuntal treatment derived from organ music, and held unswervingly to the very heart of the liturgy by means of those choral tunes which had become identified with special days and occasions in the church year.⁹ Such in brief is the history of Lutheran church music up to the time when J. S. Bach rose to prominence as the greatest Lutheran church organist and musician.

The following chart will not only acquaint us with the Lutheran service at the time of Bach, but also show how far its form was an outgrowth of that of the Catholic church, some parts of the earlier worship being entirely omitted and some retained. One gets a fair picture of what was expected from

8 *Ibid.*, p. 264.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 270

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE ORDER OF ROMAN MASS AND LUTHERAN SERVICE

CATHOLIC ORDER OF SERVICE	LUTHER		BRAUNSCHWEIG		SAXONY		ORDER OF SERVICE BOOK OF LUTHERAN CHURCH 1866
	Christian Mass Latin 1523	German Mass 1526	NÜRNBERG 1533	LÜNEBURG 1657	Prince Henry Leipzig 1681	Schwartzburg Order of Service 1675	
1. Initium Missaæ							
2. Confiteor			Confession (public)				
3. Introit	Introit	Song or Psalm	German Song by Cong.			Introit	Come Holy Ghost sung with a prayer for the Holy Spirit
4. Kyrie	Done in many melodies	Three times not nine times	Kyrie three times	Kyrie, Cantor and pupils sing O Father Almighty God.	Kyrie Eleison	Kyrie	Kyrie & Lord's Prayer
5. Gloria in Excelsis Laudamus Te	Gloria, etc.	Gloria	Gloria, etc.	Gloria sung by Cong. All Glory Be to God on High	Gloria in Excelsis Deo in Latin.	All Glory Be to God on High	Pastor— Glory to God Sung— All Glory Be to God on high.
6. Collectio	Collect (Prayer)	Collect	The Lord be with you One or more Collects	Collect to fit the Bible Reading	Collects German or Latin	Collects for the times	The Lord Be with you Versicle Collect
7. Epistola	Lessons to be used	Epistle	Chapter from Epistle of Paul, Peter, John Formal Close	Epistle loudly, clearly, slowly	Epistle	Epistle	Epistle
8. Graduale	Not the long Feast gradual— versus with Hallelujah	A German Song "Now We Pray the Holy Ghost"	A Latin verse read; the same to be sung in Latin	A German Psalm to be sung Organist to play along slowly in counterpoint style	Nothing given	A German Choral which fits with the sermon	Main Hymn or Choral.

ORDER OF SERVICE

CATHOLIC ORDER OF SERVICE	LUTHER	BRANDENBURG NÜRNBERG	BRAUNSCHWEIG LÜNEBURG	SAXONY	LUTHERAN CHURCH 1866
	Christian Mass Latin 1523 German 1524	German Mass 1526	1533	Chapter from the Evangelists or story from the Apostles	Gospel read
9. Evangelium	Evangelium Lights & Incense	Evangelium or Gospel		Gospel read	Gospel read
10. Credo	Sermon	Congregation sings We all believe in one true God	Credo to be sung in Latin or Cong. sings Confession in German	Credo in Unum Deum sung by pastor. The Cong. sings we all believe in one true God.	Credo in Unum Deum followed by sacred selection and sing- ing. "We all be- lieve in one true God."
11. Offertorium	Bread & wine brought forward while song is sung.	Prayer from the pulpit.	Congregational Song	A Psalm should be sung	"Create in me O God a clean Heart."
12. Secreta				Credo in Unum Deum	
13. Praefatio et Sanctus		Paraphrase of The Lord's Prayer	Words of Introduction Concerning Lord's Supper & Confession	Preface in German and The Sanctus Short Prayers	Preface as for special occasions Sanctus by Choir— Luther's Lord's Prayer
14. Consecratio	Read silently or spoken aloud Then Sanctus (sung)	The blessed bread distributed The singing of Sanctus—God be praised. The cup is then blessed & distributed. Cong.	Consecration spoken & Sanctus sung		
15. Praeparatio Communonis	Lord's Prayer	finishes song. It has been singing—closes, with Agnus Dei.	Lord's Prayer with introduction words in Latin	Consecration	Consecration

COMPARATIVE TABLE ORDER OF SERVICE

CATHOLIC ORDER OF SERVICE	LUTHER	BRANDENBURG LÜNEBURG	BRAUNSCHWEIG LÜNEBURG 1657	SAXONY	LUTHERAN CHURCH
Latin 1523 German 1526	German 1526	1533	Agnus Dei, also to be sung the Responsoriun Discubuit.	O Lamb of God.	Agnus Dei in Latin & the Distribution
16. Agnus	Agnus & also Prayer from Roman Mass Domine Jesu Christe, Filii Die				Christ Thou Lamb of God
17. Sumpcio	During Agnus Dei—taking Bread & Wine of officiant		Giving Communion	Communion & Congregational songs	Communion & Singing of Hymns & Psalms.
18. Communio					Cong. of Lord's Supper Hymns
19. Post Communio	Prayer from Roman Mass	Prayer of thanksgiving	Prayer	Ps. 23 read Prayers	Prayers
20. Finis Missae	Benedicimus with Hallelujah		Benedicimus		
21. Benedictio	Blessing from 4 Moses 6.	Blessing	Blessing formal.	Blessing	Blessing
John 1:1-14			Cong. song Lord keep us steadfast in Thy Word	Lord, now leittest thou thy servant depart in peace	O Lord we praise thee Lutheran Hymnal 313

organists in the common service in Bach's time. The chart also compares the church service and liturgical procedure as found in different parts of Germany. Interesting to note are the similarity in the proceedings^{10 11} and the length of time required to bring about a complete newly formed liturgical service. We notice that on the whole a tendency existed among church leaders to make changes slowly and conservatively.

A brief account of some other factors will help to form a fuller picture of Bach's work in the Lutheran church. Many of the old cross shaped churches were being changed to become more square in character.¹² The new buildings were constructed in a round style with interior decoration done in baroque and rococo. The altar was placed in such a position that everyone in the church could easily see it. Altar lights were found objectionable. Usually, however, the candles (altar lights) were lighted during administration of communion. The everlasting lights or candles were not desired. The incense burning was still a part of the service, but seems to have taken on the character of bettering the air. Usually containers were carried about by deacons. The baptismal font was placed in such a position that all could see it well, because it was used in an act which was to be a part of the regular service. The altar and pulpit were ordinarily combined and made quite ornamental. The pulpit stood centered over and above the altar. The benches, preferably, were built of oak and in rococo style. They were designed in a style which allowed for families and groups to possess their own places, much like prayer booths. Much opposition was felt to this style because of bringing in class distinctions.¹³

The customary way of lifting the offering was by means of a ringing container which disturbed the song used during the collection, and often a part of the sermon which followed. Lifting of the collection was a slow affair and the hymns with too few stanzas did not always allow for sufficient time.

The choir room and organ were usually separated from the main part of the church, to give the effect of having sounds

10 F. Loehner, *Der Hauptgottesdienst der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche* (St. Louis, 1895), P. 47. Translated from German.

11 P. Graff, *Geschichte der Auflösung der Alten gottesdienstlichen Formen in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands* (Goettingen, 1939), p. 149.

12 *Ibid.*, 11, 64.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 66.

come from another world.¹⁴ Often the organ and choir loft were placed in the balcony opposite the altar. The hymn board was a fixture. It was often quite large to allow for songs to be sung during the sermon. Bells were to be tolled one hour before service, and, on special occasions, would be rung the entire hour before service and frequently during service.¹⁵

The choir differed in organization. First to be mentioned is the school chorus which very often sang the Introit, Kyrie, Gloria in Excelsis, also Gradual, Credo, Praefatio, etc. The school boys were the backbone of this choir. Next to the rector, the cantor was the most important teacher. In some smaller localities the school teacher, cantor and organist were one. Individual responsibilities of these positions differed in different localities. The school chorus was composed of boys of all classes. Sometimes boys with unusual voices were given free instruction. Some localities had elaborate school choruses, even having adults sing regularly. These adults were allowed to make money on the side, singing for funerals, in the streets, before homes. Some of the records show these choirs to have been of very high standard.¹⁶ The school choirs were often aided by singing societies consisting of adults; lawyers, doctors, church leaders, organists, fellow teachers in church schools. The main reason for their activity in music was that superior funerals were given them. According to Rautenstrauch, these groups often did exceptional work. The motet singing thrrove under this arrangement. From the motet period which was a cappella singing during service and communion, the drift was constantly toward the cantata.¹⁷

Against this background, a description of the Lutheran church service at Leipzig will be helpful toward appreciation of Bach's position in the church. Doubly so, because he did most of his work in the churchly atmosphere.

The service started about 8:30 on Sunday morning.¹⁸ The women were seated on one side, the men on the other, or in the gallery. The bell having ceased, the organist extemporized a voluntary, leading without pause into the opening chorale, usually Allein Gott in der Hoeh sei Ehr (Glory to God in the

14 *Ibid.*, p. 67.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 79.

16 *Ibid.*, I, 259.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 261.

18 J. Curwen, *Studies in Worship Music* (London, 1885), p. 122.

highest). The number of the chorale was not announced, but from tablets placed in conspicuous places around the building, the numbers of all that were to be sung during the service could be read, while in front of the organ, which was usually in the west gallery, the number of the one which was being sung could be seen. The pace of the chorale was exceedingly slow, and probably after each line the organist would extemporize a few measures. The congregation sat to sing, and stood during prayer and at the lessons. It stood also in offering silent prayer. The chorale over, the minister standing at the altar intoned the words, "The Lord be with you," to which the choir responded, "And with thy spirit." The minister then slowly intoned a prayer (in measured speech style). At the close of the prayer, the choir sang "Amen." To this succeeded the Gospel, while the congregation stood. The creed, arranged by Luther as a chorale, in order to make it easier for the congregation, was sung and the Epistle was read from the reading desk. Then came the "Hauptlied," or chief hymn chosen with special reference to the service of the day. Perhaps only three of four stanzas were sung, and during the singing of the last of these, the preacher appeared in the pulpit, wearing the huge Elizabethan frill and black gown. With regard to the choice of text, the minister was not left quite free. The consistory of the church chose two sets of two texts each (one called the Gospel and the other the Epistle) for every Sunday in the year. In the first year set No. I was used; in the second year, set No. II; and in the third the minister was left to choose for himself. The minister having announced the chapter and verse of his text (generally in the Epistle or the Gospel for the day), the whole congregation arose while it was read, and then sat. Having given the introduction to his sermon and announced the heads of his discourse, the minister requested the congregation to join in singing a verse of a chorale. Silent prayer was then engaged in, and after a short extemporaneous prayer from the minister, he proceeded with the sermon. To the sermon succeeded the confession of sins, the absolution, a prayer for church and state, the Lord's Prayer, and finally, after the benediction, another verse of the "Sermon Chorale." The people not remaining for the communion then departed. As soon as the church was quiet again, the service was continued. While the choir (unaccompanied) sang the Sanctus, the two officiating ministers came from the vestry

to the altar; and at its close, one of them slowly intoned the Lord's Prayer in a kind of Gregorian plain chant, as far as the words, "For thine is the kingdom," at which point the choir took it up and finished the prayer in four-part harmony. Then followed the reception of the elements by the congregation, during which a chorale was sung. With the Thanksgiving and the *Dona Nobis* the service closed.¹⁹

That this form of divine service was very nearly like that in which Bach gave his talents and time is quite certain. According to Spitta, the arrangement of the Lutheran service throughout Electoral Saxony was regulated by an act issued by Duke Heinrich in 1540. This decree aimed not merely at establishing a uniform order of divine worship throughout the Duchy of Saxony and its dependencies at that time, but also at laying down a line of limitation within which different parishes and congregations might regulate their respective services according to their needs and wishes.²⁰ Some variations can be found from these services as given above. Spitta says that in Leipzig the morning service began at 7:00 o'clock. The music during Lent or in times of general mourning differed because at this time the organ was not used.²¹

The figure of J. S. Bach, already famed as an organist, marks the culmination of the period in church music which has been referred to in earlier paragraphs, that period which saw the growth of the hymns, motets, cantatas, together with the newer forms of music such as the art song and Italian opera. The period of Bach's life which tells us the most concerning his activities in church music that is at Leipzig from 1723 to 1734. The post of cantor to the townschool of St. Thomas at Leipzig was not a brilliant one, but it had certain valuable advantages.²² When Kuhnau died on June 5, 1722, the council had a choice of six men to fill the vacancy. Bach was not in this first group, but presented himself a little later when two of the chosen candidates could not meet the requirements of the new position and one could not obtain his release. Bach agreed to all the work required, even teaching the catechism and Latin to the fourth grade pupils. He signed the contract, but was then first put through a sort of examination by the consistory of Leipzig, a superior municipal body, composed

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

²⁰ P. Spitta, *The Life of Bach* (London, 1899), II, 263.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

²² *Ibid.*, II, 181.

partly of ecclesiastics and partly of laymen. This examination was given largely to ascertain the religious principles of the examinee. On Monday, May 31st, 1723, Bach's formal installation took place.²³

Leipzig at this time had three public schools, those of St. Thomas and St. Nicholas, and the orphanage. The Reformation clung to a close alliance between church and school, and so the St. Thomasschule scholars were the means most obviously at hand for the musical requirements of the Protestant service. The cantor gave instruction in singing only to the four upper classes. He was director of music in the two other churches, required to inspect organs and to superintend the town musicians, both singers and players, who had to bear a part in the church music. His duty it was to select and compose the choirs, to determine generally what should be sung, and to superintend the rehearsals held for this purpose.²⁴ When Bach took over his duties as cantor of the St. Nicolai, St. Thomas and University churches in Leipzig, he took over many problems with them. The music was at its lowest ebb. Church music as established by Kuhnau, a leading musician in the church, was being edged out by the influence of operatic music. Students joined operatic groups which came to the cities. Directors of these groups became town organists and directed the style of new church music.²⁵

Thus the cantor fell in evil days. Compositions of high class could no longer be sung at all; if attempted, the performance was so miserable that shame forbade it. To make matters worse, Goerner, a musician of the day, became director of one of those unions or operatic groups and later became organist at the St. Thomas Church where Bach was working as cantor. But Goerner, who was really under Bach's direction, was very arrogant and non-co-operative. When in the winter of 1727-8 there was a public mourning he asked permission to continue, notwithstanding, his musical gatherings. For, said he, in his union the students coming from the school (Bach's supervision) brought to perfection any skill they might have acquired there.²⁶ It throws some light on the state of affairs at Leipzig, that such a man should have played his part by the side of Bach for a whole generation. At the University Church he

23 *Ibid.*, p. 187.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 197.

25 Spitta, *op. cit.*, II, 205.

26 *Ibid.*, p. 211.

had planted his foot so firmly that Bach could not succeed in having him removed.²⁷

In spite of these hardships Bach felt confident. He made the venture, to use his own words, in the name of the Most High. The place was endowed and the duties were comparatively light. This allowed for time enough for his own occupations, over and above official required work. Bach viewed the conditions with care and set out with determination to become the controlling factor in music at the three churches. This he did, although it was no easy matter, as Goerner was a 'smooth worker' and sensed what was about to happen. Bach asserted himself in every way, musically and otherwise; he evidently emphasized his position as that of an essentially musical and independent official, and did this with all the more determination in proportion as the petty officials persisted in giving him the simple title of Cantor. It certainly was not mere caprice or arrogance which led Bach to regard his connection with the school as a secondary consideration. His music is no doubt true church music, characterized by a style of his own, but it is impossible not to perceive that it also contains the germ of an independent brand of concert music. That Bach was conscious of this peculiarity in his art is proved by his determined insistence on his position as musical director, and not as a school and church employee.²⁸

Bach set about arranging music for the Sunday worship with zeal. He allowed no infringement upon his official rights of making the musical arrangements. The council had given him authority not to permit any innovations in the services; these were and remained throughout Bach's time the same as under Kuhnau. They afforded abundant opportunity for the use of music; indeed, Bach did not usually avail himself of this to the full.²⁹ The congregational hymns were subject to censorship of the church authorities as well as the texts of cantatas. A certain series of hymns were sanctioned once for all; within these limits the cantor was free to choose. He did not even allow the pastor to change his selection. The pastor at the St. Nicolas Church, Solomon Deyling, however, was one of Bach's best friends and advisers.³⁰ It was his good fortune to work with so fine a Christian. At the other churches the pastors were

27 *Ibid.*, p. 212.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 226.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 230.

30 C. Winterfeld, *Der Evangelische Kirchengesang* (Leipzig, 1847), p. 260.

constantly being replaced and it was more difficult for Bach. Unselfishly, Deyling encouraged Bach to be active as representative at all important feasts. Bach won the admiration of all by his creations for such occasions. Notable was the celebration of the anniversary of the Augsburg Confession on June 25-27. He composed profusely for the services. His work was in the new forms of recitative arias, duets, and choruses. Music was written especially for each service to fit the sermon of the day.³¹ Bach is usually thought of as spending most of his time in this period in church work but records show that he gave organ concerts in neighboring towns, and played twice a week in Leipzig, at the kaffeehaus on Catherine Street on Tuesdays, and on Fridays from eight to ten at the same place.

Bach's idea concerning the musicians for Sunday service was that there should be 36 singers and 20 instrumentalists. He was not always fortunate enough to have them. In the St. Thomas Church he had about 20 singers and 8 instrumentalists.

In Bach's day and country there was no concert stage; the instrumental virtuoso was the organist. So when Bach "let himself go" on special festivals, it was with what may be called a religious passion; this, in addition to the connection of the organ music with the people's hymn in a chorale and the conformity of its style to that of the choir music in motet and cantata, resulted in the blending of the whole office of praise and prayer and the merging of all individual emotions into a mood of aspiration common to all.

The work performed by Bach for the church cantata was somewhat similar in nature to his service to the choral prelude but was carried out with much more lavish expenditure of creative power. He kept the notion of liturgic unity clearly in mind. He effected this unity largely by his use of the chorale as a conspicuous element in the cantata, often as its very foundation. He checked the Italianizing process by working the arioso recitative, the aria for one or more voices, and the chorus into one grand musicale scheme, in which his intricate organ style served both as fabric and decoration. By the unexampled prominence of the chorale as a mine of thematic material, he gave the cantata not only a striking originality, but also

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

an unmistakable fitness to the Confession which it served. By these means, which are concerned with its form, and still more by the astonishing variety, truth, and beauty with which he was able to meet the needs of each occasion for which a work of this kind was appointed, he endowed his church and nation with a treasure of religious song compared with which, for magnitude, diversity, and power, the creative work of any other church musician that may be named—Palestrina, Gabrieli, or whoever he may be—sinks into insignificance.

Bach's style is Teutonic in the widest as well as the most literal sense. It is based on forms identified with the practice of the people in church and home. He recognized not the priestly or the aristocratic element, but the popular. His significance in the history of German Evangelical Christianity is great.³² Protestantism, like Catholicism, has had its supreme poet. As Dante embodied in an immortal epic the philosophic conceptions, the hopes and fears of medieval Catholicism, so Bach, less obviously but no less truly, in his Cantatas, Passions, and Choral Preludes, lent the illuminating power of his art to the ideas which brought forth the Reformation. It is the central demand of Protestantism, the immediate personal access of man to God, which, constituting a new motive in national music, gave shape and direction to Bach's creative genius.

32 Dickinson, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

THE DOCTRINAL INTERESTS OF MARIUS MERCATOR

By WILLIAM BARK

Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin

From the middle of the seventeenth until the end of the first quarter of the twentieth century Marius Mercator was regarded by theologians and historians as one of the most valuable extant sources of information concerning both the Pelagian and Nestorian controversies.¹ The basis of the notable reputation which he so long enjoyed was of course the erroneous belief that he was the compiler of the *Palatine Collection*, a vast and impressive mass of papal and episcopal letters, remonstrances, sermons, confessions of faith, and memoirs used in the two ecumenical councils of the fifth century. This material concerned, almost exclusively, the heresies of Pelagius and Nestorius and apparently had been gathered together for use against the adherents of those two heresiarchs. Though little could be learned about Mercator himself, the available information gave him an impeccable position in the ranks of the orthodox. He was a disciple and correspondent of Augustine, whom he supported by savage attacks on Pelagius and other leaders of the Western heresy, and he was also known to Jerome, who, in a letter sent from distant Palestine to the Roman Donatus in the year 419, included a message to Mercator, encouraging him in his opposition to the Pelagians.²

The false interpretation of the *Collectio Palatina*, so long unchallenged, was finally exposed by the late Eduard Schwartz, who offered some conjectures as to the date and purpose of the connection and demonstrated that it was compiled not by Marius Mercator in the fifth century but by an unknown collector in

1 For the old opinion of Mercator as the diligent and formidable opponent of both heresies see H. de Noris, *Historia Pelagiana*, F. Loofs, *Nestoriana*, Tillemont, Bardenhewer, and the references in theological studies and ecclesiastical histories of the period. The general opinion was recognized by the devotion of the whole of the forty-eighth volume of Migne's *Patrologia Latina* to Mercator's works, in the edition of Father Jean Garnier with the addition of some of the notes and opinions of Etienne Baluze.

2 Augustine, *Epistolae*, 193, CSEL 57 and Jerome, *Epistolae*, 154 CSEL 56. Augustine also refers briefly to Mercator in the *De Octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*, qu. 3 in *Patrologia Latina*, XI, 159.

the sixth century.³ Schwartz's edition showed also that the compilation was not intended for use in the comparatively simple and straightforward Pelagian and Nestorian controversies of the fifth century. It was meant rather for the more involved and even more turbulent disputes of the sixth century, which in their violence wracked not only the church but also the empire and drew into their toils not only bishops, popes, and Fathers but even military commanders and emperors, eventually contributing not a little to the schism of the churches of East and West.

It is only since the appearance of this latest edition that it has been possible to assess with any accuracy the status of Marius Mercator as a doctrinal controversialist. The only works actually composed or translated by Mercator are the anti-Pelagian and anti-Nestorian treatises which together comprise about the first third of the compilation. This group includes all the anti-Pelagian writings originally attributed to Mercator but excludes most of the material directed against Nestorius. The controversialist is then as rich a course of information on the subject of Pelagianism as he ever was. But is he still to be regarded as likewise one of the chief opponents of the Eastern heresy?

Schwartz was convinced that, even though Mercator did not translate the bulk of the Nestorian works once assigned to him, he was nevertheless as deeply interested in Nestorianism as in Pelagianism and as bitterly opposed to it. He advanced several ingenious hypotheses on the subject. He attempted, for one thing, to establish some close but mysterious connection between Mercator and Cyril of Alexandria.⁴ He

3 Eduard Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1924-1925), I, 5. This work is hereafter cited as *ACO* I, 5 and the Roman numerals with this citation refer to the first preface, in which Schwartz discusses the Palatine Collection and Mercator's connection with it. For the purpose of the *Collectio* see also William Bark, "John Maxentius and the *Collectio Palatina*", soon to appear in *The Harvard Theological Review*.

4 An example of Schwartz's method of arriving at his conclusion will be revealing. It seems likely that certain Nestorian writings included by Mercator (*ACO*, I, 5, 55-50) were part of a group of excerpts from Nestorius made in Alexandria at the order of Cyril and sent by him to the pope (*Ep.* to Celestine, *Mansi* IV, 1016-1017). Since Schwartz had decided that Mercator obtained these works from Cyril, he concluded that Cyril must have sent copies to his agents in Constantinople, who handed them on to Mercator. It may have happened in that way, but at the same time there is nothing against the possibility that Mercator got the excerpts directly from the pope. Schwartz was so firm in his belief that Mercator was living in Thrace, from where he kept in touch with Cyril's representatives in Constantinople, that he overlooked the simpler and easier explana-

maintained that Mercator did not reside in Constantinople, where it would seem he must have lived if he really worked in close cooperation with the secret agents whom Cyril had stationed in the Eastern capital. But rather, according to Schwartz, the controversialist settled himself quietly as a monk in the diocese of Thrace, from where he carried on his attacks against both Pelagians and Nestorians. Schwartz contended also that whatever the monk Mercator wrote he planned for the use of monks. This would of course be after the condemnation of Pelagianism and Nestorianism at Ephesus. Schwartz had a reason for his valiant efforts to settle Mercator in Thrace; he had decided that Mercator's works were found in Thrace, after a hundred years, by some Scythian monk of the same diocese.⁵

Schwartz's hypotheses, in spite of their cleverness, are unacceptable. There is no proof at all that Mercator allied himself with Cyril and very little to suggest such a tie.⁶ That Mercator was a monk does not mean that he had to remain in one place, East or West. Dionysius Exiguus was a monk, too, according to his friend, Cassiodorus, and he traveled widely.⁷ The same is true of John Cassian and John Maxentius.⁸ There is no reason for concluding either that Mercator could not have

tion. For Schwartz's theories and conclusions, see ACO, I, 5, XII-XIV and "Die sogenannten Gegenanathematismen des Nestorius" in *Sitzungsb. d. Bay. Acad. zu München*, hist.-phil. Klasse (1922).

5 If it is true that Mercator, after becoming a monk, wrote only for the use of monks, it was a striking change, for of his two *commonitoria*, one had been presented even to Theodosius and the other was an attempt to add to Augustine's work. See ACO, I, 5, 65 and ACO, I, 5, 7. Mercator does not say in so many words that he is attempting to finish the work of his illustrious master but he makes it clear, nevertheless, that such is his ambition. What were those works, supposedly written by Mercator as a monk? No original treatises but only a few translations! Schwartz believed they indicated that Mercator had become inflamed against Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia. It seems strange that Mercator's hatred and contempt for the Eastern heresy could have stirred him to attack only after Nestorianism had been condemned, as must have been the case if Schwartz is correct, and that such feelings could have provoked him only to translation.

6 Louis Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'église* (Paris, 1911), III, 408-409, wrote of Mercator as one of the most intransigent of Cyrilians, but at the time when Duchesne wrote the whole *Collectio Palatina* was still attributed to Mercator. It was to Rome, it seems to me, that Mercator looked for guidance, rather than Alexandria. Duchesne also considered this more acceptable view that Mercator was a papal agent, *op. cit.*, 331. The same suggestion was put forward by Erich Casper, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft* (Tübingen, 1930), I, 392.

7 Cassiodorus, *Inst.*, I, 23 (ed. Mynors, p. 62).

8 O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (1924), IV, 558 and (1932), V, 14-15.

traveled, or that his writings had to be found in Thrace. The Scythian collector who included Mercator's works in the Palatine Collection could have acquired them elsewhere quite as readily, since in the course of their controversies the Scythian monks spent some time in Constantinople and in Rome.

The principal reason for Schwartz's belief that Mercator and Cyril were allied was that the editor thought he saw a close connection between Mercator's attacks on the Nestorian heresy and Cyril's well-known animosity for all things Nestorian.⁹ But the relationship between Mercator's Nestorian translations and Cyril is more apparent than real. The evidence for anti-Nestorian and pro-Cyrillian fervor on the part of Mercator turns out, upon examination, to be something quite different from what it seems.

Beyond the two *commonitoria* against Pelagian leaders, there is little to indicate Mercator's interests and labors in the period during which Schwartz thought he was showing his zeal on behalf of Cyril of Alexandria. There are a translation and refutation of the creed of Theodore of Mopsuestia, a very short piece attempting a comparison of the doctrines of Nestorius and Paul of Samosata, and translations of certain writings by Nestorius and Cyril, for some of which brief introductions were written. In his memoir against Julian of Aeclanum Mercator revealed plainly the reason for his hatred of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Theodore, he declared, was responsible for the rise of the Pelagian heresy and his views were taken to the West by Rufinus.¹⁰ In addition to that enormity, Theodore had presumed to attack Augustine himself, though he was in reality attacking the Catholic faith.¹¹ Does it not appear then that it was ardor on behalf of Augustine and against the Pelagians rather than for Cyril and against the Nestorians that stimulated Mercator to his attack on Theodore? This view gains support

9 Eltester in his article, 'Marius Mercator', in Pauly-Wissowa (1930), XIV, 1932, who follows Schwartz at almost every point, naturally does not recognize Mercator's primary concern with Pelagianism. He believes that by mingling works against the Pelagians with others against the Nestorians Mercator meant to calumniate both heresies. But neither Schwartz nor Eltester explains why Mercator does not take up the Christological controversy in any of his own writings, but merely calls it 'impious,' etc. See below.

10 *ACO*, I, 5, 5.

11 *Ibid.* 23 and see also p. 173, where the Palatine collector names Augustine as the object of an attack by Theodore. In the eyes of Mercator an attack on Augustine would in itself unquestionably be enough to earn condemnation.

from Mercator's sneering remark, in the introduction to his translation of Theodore's creed, that Julian of Aeclanum had been anathematized by Theodore after leaving Cilicia. Mercator was interested not only in exposing Theodore as the source of Pelagianism but he used him also as a means of injuring the Westerner. As for the refutation of Theodore's creed, it is comparatively mild; here Mercator's purpose seemed to be merely to present the orthodox view.

Even if it be granted that Mercator detested Theodore because of the Cilician's association with Pelagianism, the attacks on Nestorius are still unexplained. But these attacks become intelligible, when it is remembered that Theodore was the source not only of Pelagianism but also of Nestorius's Antiochene theology.¹² Thus a close connection is established between the founder of the heresy most adequately hated in the West, and Nestorius, the nominal head of the leading Eastern heresy. When we remember that Nestorius received the leaders of Pelagianism, at the time of their flight to Constantinople, Mercator's animosity becomes still clearer.¹³ Finally, Pope Celestine's coalition with Cyril of Alexandria against their hated rival of the Eastern capital is further reason why a Western theologian should have attacked Nestorius with so much venom but at the same time have given so little indication of understanding the issues involved in the Eastern dispute.¹⁴ For in all the translations of material pertaining to the Nestorian heresy, there is only one very brief work that might be said to possess any originality and then but little can be claimed for it.¹⁵

After citing a number of works by both Nestorius and Cyril, entirely lacking in interpretation, Mercator goes on again to use Nestorius and the Pelagians against each other. In order to accomplish this purpose, the translator next cites four brief tractates written, he says, by Nestorius against the Pelagian position on the question of original sin.¹⁶ There is nowhere in

12 A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (1888), II, 339-340.

13 *Ibid.*, (1890), III, 169.

14 C. J. von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, II, 183-184, and R. Seeberg, *Text-book of the History of Doctrines*, revised in 1904 by the author, translated by C. E. Hay (Philadelphia, 1905), I, 264-265.

15 That one work is the comparison of the doctrines of Nestorius and Paul of Samosata, written apparently for the purpose of vilifying Nestorius by connecting him with Paul and revealing no remarkable knowledge of Nestorianism. For it see *ACO*, I, 5, 28. In the following works of Nestorius and Cyril, pp. 28-60, there is no attempt at interpretation whatsoever.

16 *ACO*, I, 5, 60-65.

Nestorius's works any mention of the Pelagians by name but Mercator in a brief note declares that the tractates are directed against the heresy of Pelagius and Caelestius. He then adds that, though Nestorius disapproved of the Pelagian position, he still befriended the heretics and wrote a letter of consolation to Caelestius at the time when the Westerner was forced to leave Constantinople.¹⁷ This letter, the last of the translations, spoke for itself in convicting Nestorius of maintaining friendly relations with one of the leaders of Pelagianism. This course eventually proved disastrous for the unfortunate patriarch of Constantinople, for it was his aid to the Pelagians, not his doctrinal aberration, that won Nestorius the enmity of Pope Celestine.¹⁸ As it finally turned out, Celestine sacrificed Nestorius to Cyril and Cyril agreed to the condemnation of the Pelagians, in whose teachings he had previously shown no interest at all.¹⁹

The so-called "anti-Nestorian" translations of Marius Mercator then are not so much anti-Nestorian as anti-Pelagian in intent. The fiery denunciation of Theodore of Mopsuestia is a self-evident attack on Pelagianism. The trifling comparison of Nestorius's doctrine with that of Paul of Samosata is done *ignominiae causa*. And what does the controversialist say in explanation of the quotations from Nestorius? Significantly little—only that he has translated some of Nestorius's work so that his orthodox Latin-speaking brothers can avoid the heretic's errors. No explanation at all is provided for Cyril's writings, which is strange if Mercator was a fervent ally and agent of the Alexandrine bishop. If the Latin-speaking brothers were able to understand the abstruse questions involved in the struggle between the two Eastern bishops, it was not because of any light shed by Mercator. The attempt to introduce Nestorius as a foe of the Pelagian views on original

17 *ACO*, I, 5, X and 65.

18 Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II, 339-346. The Christological dispute, so fascinating to the East, had little interest for Western leaders. Celestine ordered his legates to give their support to Cyril not because the pope condemned Nestorius's theology but because he disapproved of Nestorius's refusal to break with the Western heretics. No effects on Nestorius's part to accommodate the pope in the Christological matter could assuage the papal wrath.

19 Cyril had actually received the Pelagians into communion in the East, before he knew or cared what they believed. It was only later that they came to have any significance for him. *Collectio Avellana*, *CSEL*, XXXV, 114 and Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne*, III, 264, n. 3.

sin and the letter to Caelestius both again speak for themselves as simultaneous attacks on Nestorius and the Pelagians.²⁰

Thus it becomes clear that the views set forth by Schwartz in respect of Mercator's deep interest in Nestorianism and adopted by Eltester must be rejected. Marius Mercator was not a zealous partisan of Cyril, for like Pope Celestine, he was primarily interested in thwarting the Pelagians. If it be asked why he troubled to translate the Nestorian material, the answer must be that as a bitter opponent of the Pelagians he attacked all who dared defend his enemies. He translated material concerning the Christological controversy along with documents implicating Nestorius with the Pelagians for the purpose of weakening Nestorius's position still more in the eyes of Westerners. Cyril, the ally of Celestine, was to be quoted with tacit approval and Nestorius to be decried. Just why, Mercator did not stop to explain. It was enough to introduce Cyril, blast Nestorius, and condemn both Nestorius and Theodore by pointing to their association with the Pelagians.

It is only in opposition to the Pelagians that Mercator wrote original treatises of any importance. If it should ever be discovered that he wrote as extensively and fervently in support of the Christological views of Cyril and against those of Nestorius as he did for the beliefs of Augustine and Celestine against those of the Pelagians, Schwartz's theories could be substantiated. As matters stand, however, it is safe to assume only that Mercator was a Westerner working for a Western theology and that the little attention he gave to Nestorianism was purely incidental to his primary interest in the heresy of Pelagius.

²⁰ That is, Mercator wished to point out that the Western heretics found a warm welcome only with other heretics, viz. Nestorius and Theodore. The Pelagians were belittled for associating with Nestorius and the Nestorians for receiving the Pelagians. Then as a further insult Mercator adds the deceptive, misnamed anti-Pelagian tractates of Nestorius in order to make it look as if the Pelagians were thus attacked by their last friend.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY: ITS HISTORY AND STRUCTURE TO THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

By SALO BARON. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1942. Vol. I, xiv, 374 pages; Vol. II, vi, 366 pages; Vol. III (notes, bibliography, and index), x, 572 pages. \$2.50 per volume; \$7.50 per set.

The scope and nature of Baron's work is well suggested by its bibliographic notation. Volume III is a storehouse of scholarly data and bibliography. The other two cohere in a developing scheme which is at first historical, then moves (about the end of Volume I) into a topical study of the Jewish community: membership and elections, officers, religious guidance, education, law enforcement, finance, etc.

It is an immense expanse of social history through which the author leads us. The account begins with the earliest settlements in Palestine, indeed with their background in the structure of the land itself. The Canaanite contribution is briefly sketched. And the story moves on through Israel's life in "the land of promise." Then, in the wake of Jewish dispersions from the middle east and Egypt through Europe and the Americas, it traverses the ages down to the close of the eighteenth century A.D. One gains here a fresh impression of the length and diversity of Jewish history, and of the broad command of general history that must be mastered before one can understand, much less discuss, Jewish life of today.

Professor Baron advances the thesis of a basic uniformity in Jewish community life through all its wide diversity; and the form of this was set in Israel's life in Palestine. The looseness of the royal rule, the large autonomy of city or village, the simple informal character of the courts, and many such conditions served to foster that spirit of independence and sense of law that has characterized Jewish life ever since. The Talmudic era was one of consolidation of Jewish institutions; yet through it and through subsequent centuries there was manifest an amazing variety of institutional forms which continued to the recent period where the study breaks off with only a bare glance forward to the unique types produced by American Judaism.

The striking feature of this long course of development is the independence of the local community. True, the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. saw the rise of a succession of patriarchs and exilarchs, who in a measure continued the central leadership for which the High Priest had stood. The empires were ready to exploit these institutions for their own advantage. But the authority and function of such leaders were of diminishing importance, though respected for long because of their hereditary link with the past. The real leadership of Judaism, however, was in the hands of the rabbis and the great schools that wrestled with and decided upon

questions of Jewish secular and religious conduct. This became notably true when the centre shifted from the Orient to the younger communities of Europe, where the authority of the patriarch or exilarch had all along been remote. In the Judaism of Spain, then of France, Germany, Italy, and the other European countries, it was the voice of the great rabbis in interpretation and application of Talmud and usage that guided or restrained the leaders of the hosts of local communities. They provided a spiritual rather than a legal unification of Judaism. Yet the long story shows several attempts at "super-community" Judaism. Perhaps the Jewish conferences will be adjudged most significant, anticipating as they did in embryo, the world-wide organization of Judaism in the Zionist Conference of the present day.

The Jewish community must be adjudged one of the remarkable, if not strange, phenomena of history. For since the destruction of the nation in 70 A. D., and the extinction of its remaining nationalist hopes with the overthrow of Bar Cochba, the Jews have in general lived until modern times in a state within a state, possessing a large independence within the compass of the political entity to which they paid allegiance. Commonly this condition was forced upon them from without; the various rulers under whom they have lived found it both convenient and advantageous to deal in this wholesale way with their Jewish subjects. Yet Professor Baron's survey makes it clear that the arrangement was congenial to the Jews as well; they definitely preferred to live among themselves. It has been the political theory of the western world, with its basic doctrine of religious tolerance, which has in recent times subjected Judaism and the Jewish community to a strain of a sort different from all that it has endured in the millenia of its dispersion. But Professor Baron stops on the threshold of this. He permits himself only brief comments on the problem, which serve, however, to quicken the interest for a further discussion. For here is a matter of vital importance to our present-day life. Certainly our political theory will not tolerate autonomous religious groups within our midst: all alike must stand as individual citizens before the law; and this ancestral propensity of Judaism to group solidarity and independence provides fertile occasion for the diatribes of its enemies. But more thoughtful minds will recognize that *per se* groups of Russian Jews, let us say, are not basically different in social and political character from those of Irish Roman Catholics, for example. Yet the Zionist movement constitutes a complication of the issue such that a full-scale discussion of the question by a Jew of Professor Baron's competence would be a genuine service to our social thinking.

In addition to this rather serious question with which Professor Baron leaves us, there are some minor criticisms of his work to advance, if a conclusion in adverse mood will not throw appraisal out of balance. It is astonishing to find so careful a scholar stating that "it was, in fact, the detailed blue-print for the forthcoming sanctuary prepared in exile by Ezekiel (or one of his disciples) which served as a model for the Temple of Zerubbabel" (p. 60)—a bold claim indeed! A serious weakness in the argument is the effort to explain the Babylonian community as built "on the foundations of the Palestinian township" (p. 59), for obviously they were not exiles from the "townships" at all, but from Jerusalem where

they had lived directly under the command of the king. What is to be said of the scheme of history implied by the word "subsequent" in the phrase, "in 1258, followed by the frightful decline of all western Asia as a result of the subsequent Mongol invasions" (p. 186)? Most historians will raise their eyebrows at the bland statement that Sennacherib in 701 *deported* 200,150 Judeans (p. 57). He claims to have "counted them as captives," but that is a very different matter. On p. 50 we are told that presently "Jerusalem entered a much more intimate relationship with the provincial cities than had been possible earlier. In the constant exchange of influences between the truly urban capital and the still predominantly rural provincial townships, were born those new social and religious forces which inspired the Deuteronomic Reformation." Unfortunately, the nature of available sources compels us to adjudge this claim about seventy-five per cent guesswork. And the passage is not unique in this regard. An illustration from among several is culled just two pages further on: "Neither did the centralization of sacrificial worship at the Temple of Jerusalem seriously interfere with the self-governing life of the smaller communities." Professor Baron's knowledge of the intimate life of such communities rouses the envy of the rest of us, dependent as we are on an almost complete blank in source material. A frank admission of ignorance is still an indispensable basis of all true scholarship. He was an astute rabbi who instructed his students, "Teach thy mouth to say 'I do not know' lest thou be taken in error and be confounded!"

The University of Chicago.

William A. Irwin.

ONE LORD ONE FAITH

By FLOYD V. FILSON. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943. 256 pages. \$2.00.

Not a few books have been written to demonstrate the varieties of belief among the early Christians in important areas of doctrine. Also, an important number of studies have shown that the teaching of Jesus, in so far as this can be recovered with any degree of certainty from the sources, differs in essentials as well as in details from that of the primitive church. It is almost axiomatic that early Christianity is to be characterized by diversity of belief and practice, rather than by uniformity. Also, it has been noted increasingly that the gospel about Jesus is in many respects basically different from that preached by him.

Professor Filson, of course, recognizes these differences. However, he is of the opinion that they have been exaggerated and over-emphasized. Accordingly, he presents and develops the thesis that the primitive Christians, as represented by certain books of the New Testament, were in essential agreement both among themselves and, more importantly, with Jesus on the following subjects of belief: 1) God as the ruler in human history and the Kingdom of God; 2) God as the seeking Father, whose power is controlled by mercy, and whose righteousness is expressed in love; 3) Jesus as uniquely linked with God and capable of meeting every spiritual need; 4) the redeeming power of Jesus through his death upon the cross; 5) the Spirit as ever present and powerfully active to inspire,

guide, and support; 6) faith as a prerequisite to moral living; 7) the brotherhood of believers, founded by Jesus, which developed into the Christian church; 8) the assured hope of personal immortality.

Although the argument is developed carefully and dispassionately, nevertheless the book as a whole is frankly and professedly apologetic, a factor to be taken into account in evaluating its assumptions and conclusions.

Iliff School of Theology,
Denver, Colorado.

Martin Rist.

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT

By LLOYD B. HOLSSAPPLE. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1922. xx, 473 pages. \$3.00.

The Emperor Constantine has been for centuries one of the most enigmatic figures in history; the estimates of church historians vary from the saint, "equal to the Apostles," of Byzantine tradition, to the villain of some Western estimates. In recent times there has been more effort to see what Constantine's own purposes were, as a Roman of the fourth century, and not a strange anticipation of either medieval piety or modern rationalism. The present volume is based on full knowledge of both the ancient sources and modern writers. It treats most aspects of Constantine's life in some detail, leading up to as good a sketch of his character as seems possible today (pp. 417-421). His conversion Holsapple analyzes as a genuine recognition in Christianity of the divine power which he and the Empire needed. Yet for various reasons he never quite realized that there was a force in Christianity which would not submit to be merely used by the state. This was not wholly his fault, but it largely accounts for the ambiguous results which followed from his policies, which united church and Empire without either party fully seeing what was involved.

Mr. Holsapple writes as a scholarly Roman Catholic—not a bad standpoint from which to approach Constantine, since his sympathies are not strongly engaged either for or against, and the result is probably a better understanding of Constantine himself. The work should appeal to both scholarly and popular use. The reviewer has noticed only one serious confusion, a corrupt following of Ramsay's authority on p. 246. And the author finds room to discuss the Constantine legends as well as the historical figure, information which it is useful to have available in the same context as the life of Constantine.

General Theological Seminary,
New York City.

E. R. Hardy, Jr.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF SAINT ILDEFONSUS OF TOLEDO

By SISTER ATHANASIUS BRAEGELMANN, O.S.B. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942. viii, 191 pages. \$2.00.

This doctrinal dissertation adds another noteworthy volume to the

collection of original studies of Catholic thought in Visigothic Spain produced under the direction of Dr. Aloysius K. Ziegler. The first chapter, a biographical essay, no doubt provides the best critical sketch of the life of Ildefonsus, at present, available in any language. But the author has been so diligent in rejecting the remarkable incidents which medieval legend attributed to this popular seventh century saint that her account becomes, at times, disappointingly fragmentary and obscure. The next four chapters deal competently with the manuscript traditions, sources, and contents of the authentic writings of Ildefonsus: *De viris illustribus*, *Liber de cognitione baptismi*, *Liber de itinere deserti*, *Liber de virginitate Beatae Mariae*. A final chapter contains a learned discussion of the ascription of doubtful or spurious works.

As archbishop of Toledo at a period when the King (Receswinth) was unsympathetic to the church, and the usual councils could not be held, Ildefonsus began to write in the hope of better fulfilling the duties of his pastoral office. Entirely orthodox in his theology, he was lacking in originality and ease of style; and yet his writings have certain merits which cannot be ignored. To the *De viris illustribus* (a continuation of the work of Jerome, Gennadius, and Isidore) we owe all the knowledge we possess about ten of the fourteen individuals whose lives he undertook to narrate. Though professedly a compilation, the *Liber de cognitione baptismi* throws considerable light on the ceremonies employed in the administration of baptism, confirmation, and Holy Eucharist in seventh century Spain, especially in the province of Toledo. Despite the edifying admonitions it contains, there is no reason to believe that the allegorical treatise, *De itinere deserti*, intended as a sequel to the *De cognitione baptismi*, exercised any notable influence on contemporary or subsequent thought. On the other hand, the *Liber de virginitate Beatae Mariae* is deservedly the most famous of Ildefonsus' compositions; the rhetorical artificiality of its style (in imitation of Isidore's *Synonyma*) made for its extraordinary popularity in the Middle Ages; nor is there any doubt that the work displays unusual nobility of thought and fervor of devotion. In fact, in all that he did or said Ildefonsus reveals the utterly unworldly nature of an intensely spiritual soul. No interest in, or admiration for, purely secular learning can be found in his writings. "In his beautiful outpourings to the Blessed Virgin he anticipates, in a manner the effective piety of Saint Bernard and foreshadows the devotion to Mary that was to be characteristic of future generations in the Spanish Church" (171-172).

Sister Athanasius has not only gathered together the findings of other scholars, but has, herself, contributed to our knowledge of the life and works of Saint Ildefonsus. Her very carefully documented study is equipped with an extensive bibliography and an index. The only defects, worthy of mention, the reviewer has noticed are the misprints *supra* for *infra*, p. 56, n. 110, and *sacramento* for *sacramentis*, p. 64, n. 19, and an occasional lack of uniformity in reference, e.g. under Villanueva, p. 39, and Dzialowski, p. 53, nn. 92, 93.

Xavier University,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Raymond J. Gray, S. J.

SAINT BERNWARD OF HILDESHEIM
1. HIS LIFE AND TIMES

By FRANCIS J. TSCHAN. Notre Dame, Ind.: The University of Notre Dame, 1942. vii, 235 pages. \$4.00 (paper covers \$3.25).

This monograph appears as volume VI of "Publications in Mediaeval Studies" of the University of Notre Dame. The author is professor of medieval history at Pennsylvania State College; among his other books are Helmold's *Chronicle of the Slavs* (1935), and *Western Civilization* (1942) in collaboration with Grimm and Squires. As the footnotes amply testify (there is an index but no bibliography), the present work is the result of considerable research in American and German libraries; but a more unusual claim to distinction is the interest it is likely to arouse in the diligent reader as well by the character of its subject matter as by the vividness of its presentation, and this in spite of occasional deficiencies of style.

Bernward (the name is obviously a variant of Bernhard or Bernard), the thirteenth bishop of Hildesheim, Germany, was born about 960 and died November 20, 1022. Of noble Saxon lineage—his maternal grandfather Athelbero, was count palatine of Saxony, and his uncle, Volkmar, bishop of Utrecht—he was educated at the cathedral school of Hildesheim, and made exceptional progress not only in the liberal sciences but also in the mechanical arts. Having decided upon an ecclesiastical career, he went to Mainz to complete his studies in theology, and was ordained to the priesthood by the metropolitan Willigis, archchancellor of the Holy Roman Empire. In 987, during the regency of the empress Theophano, he acted as chaplain at the imperial court and tutor to the young Otto III, then only seven years of age. In 993, he was consecrated bishop of Hildesheim. His long episcopate of twenty-nine years was replete with notable achievements for the spiritual and temporal welfare of his diocese. With barbaric Northmen and Slavs threatening the very heart of Saxony, the times appeared most unpropitious for the advancement of religion and culture. Then there were the ever urgent questions of the reform of the clergy, a trying dispute with Archbishop Willigis over the jurisdiction of Gandersheim Convent (made famous a generation before by the writings of Hroswitha), and the multiple duties which the care of his diocese and the service of such emperors as Otto III and Henry III demanded of him. But, in spite of these and other preoccupations, he never lost his active interest in architecture, painting, and the manufacture of various church articles. To the excellent practical preparation of his early years was gradually added "the advantage of having seen and studied the best work of the West."

"Bernward's interests found expression in a great variety of media and subjects. Professional crosses richly ornamented and studded with precious stones, a silver crucifix universally admired for its religious grace, candlesticks and a crosier marvellous in their symbolism, chalices and patens, coronary candelabra, two doors and a column of bronze which, with all their reliefs, are single castings, books carefully copied and rich-

ly illuminated, perhaps also vestments, three chapels and a monastery church, even city walls stand to his credit" (p. 200).

It is not possible that all these objects were the work of his hands, though all were certainly the result of his inspiration. We know from Thangmar, his former teacher and biographer, that he had unusual skill not only in copying and illuminating manuscripts but also in working the costlier metals and in mounting precious stones upon them. He is even regarded as the author of a book on mathematics. The most imposing monument of his genius, however, was the monastery chapel of St. Michael—now a Lutheran church—of which he laid the cornerstone in 1001, and for which he designed most of the articles mentioned above.

Professor Tschan is to be congratulated for the fine summary he has provided of the life and times of St. Bernward; by a judicious use of historical material he has not only shed new light upon an old subject but has helped to solve a number of controverted questions. It is to be hoped that he will be able to fulfill his intention of supplementing the present study by another dealing more exclusively with Bernward's art. Where there is so much to praise it may seem ungracious to find fault, but the following points ought probably to be mentioned: the misprints, "Hauts Études" for "Hautes Études" (p. 103, n. 8) and "and" for "und" (p. 105, n. 15); occasional incorrect use of words, *e. g.* "years" for "time," "contradictory" for "inconsistent" (p. 83), "survived" for "were to survive" (p. 132), "begot families" for "begot children" (p. 151); finally, although the book is carefully printed, the price is too high for a work of this kind.

Xavier University,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Raymond J. Gray, S. J.

AN INTRODUCTION TO FRANCESCO PATRIZI'S NOVA DE UNIVERSIS PHILOSOPHIA

By BENJAMIN BRICKMAN. New York, 1941. 81 pages.

Patrizi was one of those exponents of Neoplatonism in the Renaissance who by means of an hierarchical system of emanations from the All-One posited a continuous universe to be understood by the application of mathematical method. The author has done careful work on the bibliography and biography of Patrizi and in the analysis of his thought through a methodical exposition of his treatises. In some measure Patrizi is related to previous and contemporary systems. Amplification at this point would have been desirable. Less explosion and more comparison would have given the reader a clearer notion of the significance of Patrizi and of his school of thought.

A discussion, for example, of the bearing of the revival of Neoplatonism on the enthronement of man would have been highly relevant and instructive. The assumption is that during the Renaissance man was elevated because God and nature were linked in a "sort of communion." Why not say in "a great chain of being" and consult Lovejoy's work on that subject? And precisely what is so novel or so elevating for man in this picture? The mind of man, we are told, according to Patrizi is "linked with God." Is this the doctrine of the Greek theologians that man is ca-

pable of *deificatio*? Or is it the rationalism of Aquinas? And if only the mind is linked and the body is disparaged how is the whole man enthroned and where is the bridge to naturalism of which the author so frequently speaks; or does the Neoplatonism of the Renaissance depart from the classical variety of Plotinus?

Take another example of lesser moment. The character and the ramifications of *Lichtmetaphysik* are recognized. Yet a study of Bäumker's *Witelo (Beiträge z. Geschichte d. Philosophie des Mittelalters, III, 1908)* would have cleared up the distinction between created and uncreated light whereby Augustine harmonized the eternal light form of Plotinus with the created light of Genesis.

In a word, this study is thorough and exact as far as it goes. A more mature scholar would have taken Patrizi as a constant point of departure for the elucidation of broader problems.

Yale University.

Roland H. Bainton.

THE EVERYDAY WORK OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY

By S. W. CARRUTHERS. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society (of America) and Presbyterian Historical Society of England, 1943. xi, 210 pages. \$2.50.

Dr. Carruthers is an English physician who has long studied the Westminster Assembly. In 1937 he published a critical text of the Confession of Faith based on the seven earliest editions. In this book he contributes to the celebration of its tercentenary a speaking likeness of the Assembly at its work. Making use of the official journal and contemporary reports, among which inevitably the toothsome Baillie is liberally quoted, he sets forth the daily activities of the Assembly in connection with a wide diversity of tasks and interest. Because these do not include its main productions, the account of them perhaps the better displays the temper of the Assembly in various situations, the individualities of its members, its groups and parties, the facts of its political and ecclesiastical relations and its significance in its time. The picture is the more vivid because of the large employment of the language of the sources; "comment has been kept down." The chapters cover the Assembly's dealings with Parliament, the Scottish General Assembly and foreign churches; its conduct of business and sessions for worship; attention to current heterodox teachings; work on the Articles and the metrical Psalms; the provision of ministers for the English parishes; "Personal Matters" and "Miscellaneous Items," under which there are much of real importance and much diverting.

"The complete subordination of the Assembly to Parliament" is well known, but the details here exhibit unforgettably both the subordination and the Assembly's attitude toward it, curiously compounded of deference and resistance. "No English Parliament could be aught but Erastian; no Puritan Assembly . . . could waive the right of the Church of Christ to govern itself." The clash of authority culminated twice,

in the Commons' charge against the Assembly of breach of privilege in 1646 and in Parliament's striking from the Confession of Faith the declaration of the freedom of church government. It is surprising that Dr. Carruthers makes only a passing reference to the amendments to the Solemn League and Covenant adopted by Parliament, on the advice of the Assembly. A. F. Mitchell and W. A. Shaw have commented on the importance of these changes, as committing Parliament and the Assembly to the Scottish church system not absolutely, but with a reservation, and to the rejection of "prelacy" as it then existed in the Church of England, but not in principle. "Relations with Foreign Churches," i. e. the continental Reformed, a neglected aspect of the Assembly, shows its ecumenical spirit, and that of Puritanism as well. Among the most lifelike parts of the book are "Procedure," "Devotional exercises," "Fasts and Thanksgivings." Baillie's oft-quoted complaint appears: "the nature itself of their way is so longsome that it is impossible to be shortened." "Nothing in any Assembly that ever was in the world, except Trent, is like to them in prolixity." The longsomeness was incidental to the Assembly's freedom of debate, to which all of these chapters testify. The divines appear more human when we read the prohibition of 1645 against bringing in "books or papers to be read privately," "private communication," and "ordinary going from one place to another." There were giants in those days; on May 19, 1644, a fast-day for the Parliamentary army, there were two prayers each occupying two hours, two sermons recorded as an hour long and a third, more prayers and "a short sweet conference."

Any idea that the Assembly was a body of cloistered theologians formulating doctrine *in vacuo* is dispelled by much in this book, not least by "Sectaries and Heretics." The divines gave keen attention to preachers and writers of whom the Puritans disapproved, especially Antinomians, also "Anabaptists, Brownists, etc." Several such cases were reported to Parliament, and in consequence two men were imprisoned for short terms and Paul Best, an Antitrinitarian, was condemned to death by Parliament, but released in 1647 after two years' confinement. Another neglected feature of the Assembly, its revision of the Thirty-nine Articles, receives justice here. Dr. Carruthers prints a comparative text showing the changes made by the Assembly in the fifteen revised Articles, some of which are interesting in connection with the Confession of Faith. His extracts from the journal prove that, contrary to some opinions, this task was taken seriously and that "neither Parliament nor Assembly was so radical as to desire simply to sweep away the Articles." The chief activity of the Assembly after the production of its documents in doctrine, church government and worship was examination for the appointment of parish ministers. This went on for eight years, involved many hundreds of candidates and "must undoubtedly have had a strong effect upon the religious life of the country for a generation." Dr. Carruthers shows from the journal the principles and methods adopted by the Assembly for this work which, like so much else that it did, lacked precedent, and then the action in a large number of cases.

Among the many books on the Westminster Assembly none is

comparable to this. In its text and references it will henceforth be indispensable for study of the subject. One result of its reading will be what the author says he has experienced, a higher idea of the character and abilities of the members of the Assembly. The book is published jointly by the Presbyterian Historical Society (of America) and the Presbyterian Historical Society of England. But its production in England would have been impossible because of the paper shortage, and the American Society has given a distinguished service by publishing it in this country.

Union Theological Seminary,
New York City.

Robert Hastings Nichols.

JOHN AMOS COMENIUS: THAT INCOMPARABLE MORAVIAN

By MATTHEW SPINKA. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943.
vii, 177 pages. \$2.00.

John Amos Comenius is one of those figures in history which constantly grow in stature. His reputation in the field of education has long been established; it is only recently, however, that the place of Comenius as one of the outstanding intellectual leaders in the religious and international crisis of his day has begun to be recognized in English writings. Close upon the publication of *The Teacher of Nations*, containing addresses delivered at the University of Cambridge on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of Comenius' visit to England, comes the present volume by Dr. Matthew Spinka. Both volumes are more than a tribute to a historic figure in Czech history; they represent an appreciation of Comenius' many-sided activities in a period of world revolution analogous to the revolution through which the world is passing today.

It is in this connection that Dr. Spinka's small but compact book—not the least valuable part of which is the fifteen page bibliography of works by and about Comenius—assumes especial importance. Dr. Spinka has well fulfilled his aim “to present briefly but adequately, the entire scope of Comenius' interest and activity—pedagogical, ecumenical, and pansophic—instead of restricting it to educational reforms, as has been done hitherto by most biographers.” The fact is that Comenius' proposals for educational reforms were inseparable from his ecumenical and pansophic proposals. The world conditions which inspired Comenius' work throughout his life are not unlike the conditions which have stimulated the organization of the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion or, in part at any rate, H. G. Wells' plea for a “World Brain.” In a war-torn world, when men have lost their sense of direction, Dr. Spinka's hope for the fulfillment of Leibnitz' entreaty will be shared more intelligently by all who read his book: “May the time come, Comenius, when multitudes of men of good will shall pay homage to thee, thy deeds, thy hopes, and thine aspirations!”

Teachers College,
Columbia University.

I. L. Kandel

THE GREAT CENTURY IN THE AMERICAS, AUSTRALASIA,
AND AFRICA, A. D. 1800-A. D. 1914

By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.
ix, 516 pages. \$4.00.

This fifth volume of Professor Latourette's account of the expansion of Christianity maintains the high standards set by its predecessors. As a comprehensive history of the planting and growth of Christianity in fields most neglected by historians it gives further assurance that the series will long be regarded as the definitive history of Christian missions. The present volume involves peculiar difficulties in research, method, arrangement, and presentation. Chronologically, it covers the period, 1800-1914, involving the revival of Roman Catholic missionary enterprise and the rise of complex development of the major types of Protestant missionary endeavor. Geographically, it is concerned with an area covering over half the globe, including the Americas (except the United States), Australasia, and Africa south of the Sahara.

Despite this range in time and space, the author discovers an essential unity in the record. In the nineteenth century, European peoples found their way into areas where primitive cultures prevailed. Under the impact of their influence upon the cultural, economic, and political life of primitive peoples, western civilization was extended and the old order gradually gave place to the new. Never before in so short a time had Christianity or any religion penetrated so vast an area. The task of Christian missions was the same in most of the countries discussed in this volume: non-European peoples must be won to the Christian faith; they must be protected from exploitation by invading whites; they must be assisted in the arduous work of adjusting themselves to new cultures; and the Christian faith must be maintained in the new nations which emerged after the immigrants arrived. The volume records the efforts of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism to meet these challenging needs.

In many instances the author provides students of church history with the first comprehensive account of the planting and growth of the Christian church in the areas under consideration. Ample bibliographical aids are provided for the more intense study of the Christian movement in each field. Unfortunately, the maps provided lack sufficient detail to make them thoroughly serviceable to readers of the volume. Covering so vast an area, the volume is necessarily sketchy and inadequate in dealing with some fields. For instance, neither Protestants nor Roman Catholics will be satisfied with the treatment of the church history of Cuba in two brief paragraphs. Missionaries and missionary administrators concerned with many of these fields will feel that more attention should have been given to nineteenth century trends and movements which have resulted in the rise of indigenous churches in the period since 1914. However, most readers of this volume will marvel at its comprehensiveness rather than complain of such omissions.

Scarratt College, Nashville, Tenn.

J. Minton Batten.

RELIGIOUS PROGRESS THROUGH RELIGIOUS REVIVALS

By FRANK GRENVILLE BEARDSLEY. New York: American Tract Society, c. 1943. ix, 181 pages. \$1.50.

On the next to the last page of the book under review there is a passage which reveals a purpose. It reads: "Since religious revivals have played so important and so vital a part in the religious progress which has been achieved in the days that are past and gone, is it not reasonable to suppose that our hopes for the progress of religion in the days that are yet to come will depend to no inconsiderable extent upon like spiritual quickenings in the future?" The author of this book believes that the historical record that he has examined proves that religious revivals in modern times have been amply justified by the good fruits they have brought forth, and accordingly he pleads for a revival of religious revivals. Appropriately, therefore, he dedicates his book to those who now labor to promote revivals of religion.

The first five chapters of the book pass in brief review the most significant revivals of modern times, beginning with the Great Awakening in colonial America. The second chapter deals with the Evangelical Revival in England. The author then turns once again to the American scene to describe the awakening of 1800 (a term he uses to cover all American revivals for about a half-century), the Revival of 1857-58, and the labors of several American evangelists, of whom he considers Charles G. Finney and Dwight L. Moody especially worthy of his notice. The rest of the book is, in general, concerned with "the permanent contributions which have been made to religious progress by the religious revivals with which the churches have been visited." Such contributions the author finds, quite properly, in the development of the modern missionary movement, in the growth of the religious press, in the rise of Sunday Schools, in the promotion of education, and in the furtherance of humanitarian and moral movements—the movement for the abolition of slavery being particularly noteworthy.

In pronouncing judgment on the effort of the author, it is well to keep in mind the task he set for himself. This book was not intended to be a reference work for scholars. It is a popular treatise, addressed to the general reader, and consequently it is not encumbered with a bibliography or with other impediments of scholarship. Essentially it is a brief historical survey, and like all other historical surveys it leaves something to be desired. Because of over-generalizations and of necessary omissions of important material, it sometimes gives wrong impressions. A few examples will illustrate this observation. In the first place, it leads one to believe that the Great Awakening began in New England; secondly, it induces one to underestimate the explosive power of American religious revivals in the early 1850's; and, lastly, it fails to keep one's attention steadily fixed upon the important fact that religious and humanitarian movements in the United States during the first decades of the nineteenth century owed a great deal to British examples. From a reading of the book one might well carry away the impression that American religious

revivals alone had produced consequences that were actually the result of various forces acting in conjunction with one another. The reviewer believes that the thesis, which he accepts as essentially sound, has been overworked.

The book, however, has positive merits. It contains some excellent passages, and, although it makes no original contribution to the subject of American religious history, it is so suggestive that it may well be the means of leading more than one reader to more extensive writings in the broad field that it traverses. It can hardly fail to convince any reader who needs to be convinced of the fact that religious fervor was a powerful force in nineteenth-century America. Whether the book will or will not be an important contribution to the object the author had in mind when he wrote it remains to be seen.

Bucknell University.

J. Orin Oliphant.

POPULAR FREETHOUGHT IN AMERICA, 1825-1850

By ALBERT POST. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. 258 pages. \$3.00.

This monograph is "a study of the freethought movement among the masses" during the period from the revival of organized freethought in the United States in 1825 to its noticeable decline in 1850. No attempt is made to consider all aspects of free-thought, emphasis being placed "almost exclusively on religion." This is one of the lesser chapters in our religious history and repetitious, its ideas being those of the enlightenment and its optimism that of Deism. Dr. Post has done an excellent job in mapping the range of this movement, its press, societies, propaganda, and the attacks upon it. The significance for the "masses" is less clearly stated: for example, the author says, "The return to reason did not greatly affect the thinking of the masses" and later that "among the lower and middle classes rationalism became more common and Christianity was forced to make concessions."

This revival of freethought resulted "primarily" from the large immigration from the British Isles, following the Panic of 1819. In this migration there came Robert and Robert Dale Owen, Frances Wright, Gilbert Vale, and Benjamin Offen who played the chief roles in the organized movement. By 1850 this movement had run its course: spiritualism was bidding for attention, the slavery controversy was involving the masses and, significantly, the immigrant leadership had disappeared. To this reviewer, more than to the author, this chapter in the history of free-thought is not so much an American chapter as a British one. Britons, faced with persecution for religious radicalism at home, fled to America and here waged war against Christianity and its clergy. With the passing of that immigrant leadership, this episode in freethought passed. There were Americans, of course, in this story, but they were the lesser figures. German "Forty-Eighters" with their rationalism also contributed. Their author observes that these freethinkers (infidels, deists,

sceptics, liberals, rationalism—terms used synonymously) espoused one or more of the reformed movements of the day, but whether to a greater degree than did the orthodox Christian he has not told. Dates of publications vary as between text and bibliography in two or three cases and the index is not always adequate; but these are incidental in an excellent and definite study.

Rutgers University,
New Brunswick, N. J.

Irving Stoddard Kull.

ELIJAH EMBREE HOSS: ECUMENICAL METHODIST

By ISAAC PATTON MARTIN. Nashville, Tennessee: Parthenon Press, 1942. 487 pages. \$3.50.

This volume will prove a definite contribution toward the understanding of the history of Southern Methodism. Elijah Embree Hoss, native of Jonesboro, Tennessee, was licensed as a preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1866. For more than half a century he was a recognized leader of his denomination, serving as preacher, educator, editor, and bishop. The author permits this unique personality to tell the story of his own life. The numerous quotations from the Hoss articles, correspondence, books, and editorials are set within a framework of interpretive comment which makes the volume more readable and informing. As a pastor, Hoss served in border territory where the conflict between Northern and Southern Methodism was especially strong. His experiences in dealing with problems of reconstruction in such an area furnish much needed light on a neglected phase of American church history. As an educator, he helped to win recognition for the church college as an effective agency in rebuilding the cultural and religious life of the South in the period following the Civil War. As the editor of the most influential connectional paper of his denomination, he continuously challenged his church to new advances in the fields of missions, education, and social reforms. Though recognized as the proponent of the Southern point of view on many controversial issues, Bishop Hoss well deserves the title of Ecumenical Methodist as conferred by his biographer. His efforts to contribute toward a workable plan for the unification of Methodism, though often misunderstood or misinterpreted, are presented in this volume in true perspective. His bitter fight to keep Vanderbilt University under church ownership and control resulted in failure, but few readers of this volume will question the sincerity of the convictions which prompted him to make the struggle. Unfortunately, this instructive biography is marred by the inclusion of a considerable amount of extraneous material and by frequent repetitions. More than thirty times testimony is introduced to prove that Bishop Hoss liked the mountains of East Tennessee. But Bishop Hoss, always a loyal Tennessean, would have enjoyed this feature.

Scarritt College,
1943. 180 pages. \$1.50.

J. Minton Batten.

THE FIGHT OF THE NORWEGIAN CHURCH AGAINST NAZISM

By BJORNE HÖYE and TRYGVE AGER, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1943. 180 pages. \$1.50.

When the Nazi invaded Norway, it was quite evident that the Christian church in Norway would be severely tested. What we have known of this process of testing has come to us in the past from more or less reliable sources. *The Fight of the Norwegian Church Against Nazism* is the story of this testing based on official documents. It is not a book of propaganda, and there is no sensationalism in it. The two young authors, who are connected with the offices of the Norwegian government in London and Washington, are telling us a story of Christian courage and religious conviction which has not often been surpassed in the history of the Christian church. Men like the Bishops Berggrav, Stören, and Maroni, together with the ordinary clergymen and school teachers, will long be remembered, as they are fighting not only for their own rights of religious liberty, but also for the rights of the persecuted Jews.

All the important official documents are printed in the book, so it is easy to follow the historic development of the struggle.

Northern Baptist Theological Seminary,
Chicago, Ill.

P. Stiansen.